

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1878.

The Week.

CONGRESS meets to-day, and there is, of course, a great variety of opinion as to the effect of the recess on the attitude of members towards the silver question, but the preponderance seems to be in favor of a decline in the fervor of the supporters of the movement and a corresponding improvement in the chance of the defeat of the Bland Bill. Like all compounds of fraud and folly it suffers greatly from discussion, so that time runs against it. We think we see an abatement in the ardor even of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, and in that amazing credulity about the "conspiracy" which has reminded so many people of scenes in the history of the Commune, when every day produced a new story of "plots" and treason directed against "the people" by the bankers, lawyers, judges, priests, soldiers, shopkeepers, and, in fact, everybody who followed a regular calling and liked to know beforehand where he would get his dinner. The bankers in the large cities, we are glad to see, are beginning to bestir themselves. A meeting was held in this city on Saturday which was attended by representatives of twenty-seven of the leading banks, and appointed a committee to recommend suitable action in a report to be presented to an adjourned meeting on Wednesday. This step has been promptly seconded by the Banking Association of Boston. The New Orleans Clearing-house Association have passed resolutions denying that the South is favorable to the silver movement, and denouncing the Bland Bill in unqualified terms. The way in which all banks and moneyed corporations can best help to defeat the silver-men is, as we recommended long ago, to make no time-loans except in gold. This is a legal, feasible course, and would reduce the silver legislation, even if carried out, to mere wind in the course of six months. Mr. Winston, the President of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of this city, reports to his Financial Committee that the passage of the Bland Bill would reduce the value of the assets of the Company by \$4,200,000, which would come not out of the pockets of "money sharps," but out of the fund which guarantees the provision made by vast numbers of hard-working men for their widows and orphans.

Rumors still continue to come from Washington of approaching revelations, based on the Chandler letter, of corrupt bargains between the friends of the President and the Southerners of both parties in order to secure the undisturbed possession of the Presidency. The bargain with the Louisiana Returning Board, which Chandler says Hayes broke, was, if made, undoubtedly corrupt, and, if provable, would be an impeachable offence; but nothing can better illustrate the moral condition of the Republican leaders than the fact that this consideration apparently never occurred to Chandler, and that he accuses Hayes not of having made the agreement, but of having violated it. His bringing the charge at all, however, shows that the men who engineered the Republican campaign are disappointed in Hayes, and are now ready, if they see a chance, to ruin him, even if they make nothing by it. This alone is what makes an investigation at all probable. If the Republicans are willing to expose their own corruption, of course the Democrats will not object, and then enough excitement and discredit for the Administration would grow out of it to turn popular attention away from reform, and make all further efforts in that direction impossible.

Mr. Halstead's assertion, in his late letter to the *Nation*, that he had "advertised in vain for a member of Congress who can say that he voted for the demonetization of silver, knowing when he cast his vote what it meant," is a method of proving that

silver was "surreptitiously" demonetized of such exceeding simplicity that we have never thought it worth much notice, particularly as one of the most blatant silver agitators, Mr. William D. Kelley, was chairman of the committee which recommended the demonetization, and supported it in a speech from which we have already published extracts, declaring that he had never given any bill such careful examination. Anybody who can tell now why this eminent man does not come forward in answer to Mr. Halstead's "advertisement" and claim the reward, can explain also the silence of scores of other Congressmen who probably understood the subject just as well as Kelley. Anybody can guess the reason of this silence. This mode of discussing a financial question is, however, so puerile that we feel a little ashamed of taking part in it.

A telegram from Washington to the New York *Tribune* of the 31 inst., drawn out by Mr. Halstead's letter, quotes from the speeches of Messrs. Kelley of Pennsylvania, Potter of New York, McNeely of Illinois, Hooper of Massachusetts, and Stoughton of Michigan, showing that these at least knew perfectly well what was going on. The despatch shows also that the proposal to demonetize was fully discussed by three ex-directors of the Mint, the Superintendent of the New York Assay Office, Mr. E. B. Elliott, Mr. Robert Patterson, and others in a report to the Secretary in 1870. The *Banker's Magazine* also published, in July, 1870, the report of the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency explaining the object of the demonetization bill. In the following year it published the correspondence of the Deputy Comptroller with several persons, in which the object of the bill, as regards demonetization, was again explained. The New York Chamber of Commerce discussed the bill ten months before its passage; the National Board of Trade discussed it six months before its passage; and a paper of Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles discussing it was in December, 1872, mailed to every member of Congress. What is the answer to all this? Why, "gold plot," "goldites," "gold sharks," "money kings," "gold-bugs," "dollar of our fathers," "fraud," "laboring man," "toiling millions," "Mississippi Valley," "silver eagle, one wing in Gulf of Mexico, the other in Lake Superior, tail in the Rocky Mountains," "bloated bondholders," "coupon-clippers," "sponge," "bloodshed," "anarchy"; and the people from whom this comes are not French peasants, or Russian Muzhiks, or Parisian Jacobins, but Americans bred in the common schools and long used to self-government.

The question of the Texan frontier disturbances has been again under consideration by the Cabinet during the week, as well as by the House sub-committee on military affairs; and the more it is examined the less cause is there for any heat about it. The Cabinet had laid before it two letters from the collector of customs at El Paso, giving a lucid account of the origin of the salt troubles, and for the first time bringing to light their political aspect. It appears that the salt lakes a hundred miles from El Paso, after having from time immemorial been freely visited and worked by the inhabitants of both sides of the Rio Grande, chiefly Mexicans, were thrown open to "location" by private parties by the Texas Constitution of 1868. In the effort to avert this the Texas Mexicans fell a prey to "designing politicians," who, in return for their votes, promised to obtain for them from the State the absolute right and title to the region. Partly through the usual faithlessness of demagogues, and partly because of the obstacles they encountered, the law remained unchanged. The Texas-and-Pacific road had meantime been granted these "lakes," so that no State patents could be issued for them, and, failing to be built beyond Fort Worth, it could not procure sufficient State certificates to meet the demand. When at last locations were obtained by an Austin company, they sent an agent, one Howard, to look after their property and keep off trespassers. Howard stationed himself at El Paso, and provoked an outbreak by persuading the county judge to order the arrest of men who had

merely threatened to go to the lakes in company with the rest of the town. Then followed mob violence, beginning with the arrest of the judge and the seizure of the agent, who had sought refuge with the sheriff; his confinement at San Elizario until he promised to admit free access to the lakes; his withdrawal to New Mexico, and subsequent return to El Paso, where he met and killed Mr. Cardis, the adviser of the Mexicans. For this act Howard was under bonds to appear in court next March, when, in December, with the support of some Texan rangers, he insultingly went to San Elizario to ensure the arrest of parties about returning to that place from the lakes. The result was a collision, in which, as is well known, the rangers were surrounded and forced to surrender, and Howard himself was taken and shot. In this mêlée there is no doubt that some Mexican citizens participated.

Secretary Schurz has taken the first step towards a thorough purging of the Indian Bureau. Unlike his predecessor, Mr. Delano, he formed his investigating committee with a view to discovery and not to whitewashing, making it consist of the chief clerk of the Interior Department, an army officer, and a member of the Attorney-General's office. We are sorry to say that the result shows that neither the piety of Commissioner E. P. Smith nor the high business capacity and perfect integrity of Secretary Chandler sufficed to fathom the depths of iniquity of the Bureau, and that the efforts of the unpractical doctrinaire who now controls the department to accomplish the same end were crowned with success, in spite of his enquiry being "hindered in every conceivable way" by the employees under inspection. The chief clerk of the Bureau, S. A. Galpin, is acquitted of personal corruption, but is censured for having kept back charges that were filed against certain fraudulent contractors (on the ground that he knew the persons and believed them innocent), and with having improperly delegated his authority in order to go home to vote. The committee find the correspondence, filing of papers, and general business routine of the Bureau to have been shockingly irregular, and exactly adapted to foster corrupt combinations within and without; a "group" was formed, with clerk Galpin at its head, which gave direction to all matters of importance that passed through the office. The Annuity Clerk, who had been employed for twenty-one years, received blankets and other presents from contractors, and openly expressed his regret that the "good old times" when such practices were innocent had passed away—a sentiment which at once cost him his place. Even the stenographer was more than a mouthpiece, and was privy to what went on behind the scenes. The letting of contracts in New York was entrusted to a clerk of no business experience, who kept no official record of bids or shipment of supplies, etc. Collusion between traders and agents in the purchasing of needed supplies in open market at the eleventh hour; frauds in weighing cattle; unsettled accounts of long standing; unchecked expenditures by agents—in one case of \$500,000; frauds in the disbursement of "miscellaneous receipts"; appointment of traders without approved bonds, or with the approval in excessive number by one agent, who could not possibly have verified them; collusion with traders in paying Indians for labor with tokens instead of in cash, and false returns for such outlays to the Bureau—complete the dismal tale, which no "Pi-Ute" levity can dispose of. That Mr. Schurz will follow the recommendations of his committee without delay is perfectly understood in the Indian Bureau.

Governor Rice, of Massachusetts, was suspected before his recent election of lukewarmness and hostility towards civil-service reform as defined in the Republican platform and Mr. Hayes's letter, but he managed with great skill to put the charge aside. He has now in his message thrown off all, or nearly all, disguise in the matter, and ranged himself virtually on the side of Conkling and the Chandlers. He is, however, very gentle and tentative in his opposition, as becomes so friendly and conciliatory a man. What he says is "that it has sometimes appeared [only "sometimes"] to those who have given thought to the matter," that the reason why civil-

service reform has not succeeded is, "that it would engraft on our republican government the characteristics of the civil service of monarchies." You see, he does not mention what these "characteristics" are. "Many of the complaints," he adds, "made against the American civil service are complaints against the republican form of government itself," and so on, the old story. Now, we suggest to the Governor that he shall lay his hand on his kindly heart and ask himself these questions, as a means of getting to the bottom of this troublesome question: As a matter of fact, was the present "spoils system," as it is called, introduced, like the election of members of Congress, for instance, into this Government deliberately, as part and parcel of republican institutions, and with the view of promoting republicanism? If not, how, by whom, and for what reasons was it introduced? In what way does the American people profit by it, and how would the American people be injured by the proposed changes? If the interests of the majority, such as economy, accuracy, fidelity, and honesty, are not tests of the republicanism of a service, what are those tests? We are greatly afraid that "those" whom the Governor quotes are not persons who "have given thought to the matter." They have been imposing on him. What they have been telling him is mere gossip they have heard from Messrs. Butler and Boutwell. There is no second opinion among those who "have thought about the matter."

Mr. Bancroft Davis has made a contribution of considerable importance to the Sumner-Motley-Fish controversy, which will probably end it. He recalls the fact that Mr. Sumner, in his speech in April, 1869, on the Johnson treaty, in stating the case against England, put down her liability to the United States in this way:

Loss of ships.....	\$15,000,000
Loss in the carrying trade.....	110,000,000
Loss through prolongation of the war.....	2,000,000,000

Total liability of England.....\$2,125,000,000

or about £425,000,000 sterling, being considerably more than half the present national debt of that country. This speech was delivered without consultation with the Administration, but attracted much attention, as coming from so responsible a person as the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, and of course seemed to make settlement by negotiation hopeless, as it would have been cheaper for England to fight three campaigns than settle with Mr. Sumner. The Crimean War only added \$500,000,000 to her debt. He also laid it down that the concession of belligerency was the first and great source of England's pecuniary liability.

Before the speech, Mr. Motley had been sent to England on Mr. Sumner's earnest recommendation, and Mr. Sumner's repeated attempts to draft his instructions making the belligerency proclamation a grievance sounding in damages had been repelled, and Mr. Fish drafted them himself, with one or two unobjectionable passages of Mr. Sumner's inserted. How, in spite of this, being strongly under Mr. Sumner's influence, Mr. Motley kept injecting the belligerency matter into his communications with the British Government, and how after several threats and rebukes he was finally recalled with needless contumely, is a story known to everybody. The President, who disliked him, wished to recall him in October, 1869, but was prevented by Mr. Fish's remonstrances. He was actually recalled on July 1, 1870, immediately after the rejection of the San Domingo Treaty, June 30, 1870. Naturally enough, the rejection of the treaty under Mr. Sumner's attacks has been looked on as the cause of the removal, and it probably did precipitate it; but that it was determined on previously, and if Grant had had his way would have taken place, Mr. Davis's statement seems to leave no doubt.

Now comes the question of the cause of Mr. Sumner's removal from the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This has been treated, not unnaturally too, as the result of the President's and Mr. Fish's hostility, partly personal

and partly owing to the San Domingo Treaty. Mr. Davis shows, however, that in January, 1871, the Administration being desirous of negotiating a settlement of the Alabama quarrel, Mr. Fish sought, and obtained through Senator Patterson, a friendly interview with Mr. Sumner, and submitted to him the ideas of the Administration with regard to that settlement. Mr. Sumner took time to consider them, and then sent a "memorandum" to Mr. Fish, now for the first time published, containing what Mr. Sumner considered the essential basis of negotiation. One was the absolute withdrawal of the British flag "from this hemisphere, including provinces and islands," as "a condition or preliminary." Another was the prohibition of a discrimination in favor of claims arising from the depredations of any particular ship—or, in other words, Great Britain was to acknowledge herself responsible in the lump for the depredations of *all* the ships which preyed on American commerce. Of course this plunged poor Mr. Fish in despair, and he was only reassured by finding that the rest of the Senate did not share Mr. Sumner's views, and would support a reasonable treaty; but they determined of their own accord, Mr. Davis says, that under the circumstances Mr. Sumner's presence at the head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was out of the question.

The conclusions which we believe most unprejudiced persons will draw from the whole story are two: one is that Mr. Sumner's speeches both on the Johnson Treaty and on the San Domingo Treaty showed that in 1870 and 1871, or thereabouts, his mind had to a considerable degree lost its balance, and that the "memorandum" was simply a fresh illustration of the disorder in his sense of proportion; the other is that during the anti-slavery conflicts and the war Mr. Sumner's earnestness and vehemence were so well suited to the times and to the work he was engaged in that they concealed from his friends and the public, and probably from himself, his incapacity for affairs of greater delicacy and complexity. We may add that his plan of having Great Britain withdraw from this continent was not kept to himself in 1871. It appeared, we believe, in the columns of the New York *Tribune*, the then excitable manager of that paper evidently considering it A Mighty and Pregnant Idea.

Although there were many failures during the week there were none in Wall Street of sufficient importance to unsettle the Stock Exchange. The revelations of the Bonner failure, however, were so shocking that until late in the week there was great difficulty in making loans, and the rate for money advanced to one-quarter of one per cent. per day. This was an extreme rate, but $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per day was common until late in the week, when loans having been very generally examined and no other frauds discovered, something like confidence returned and money lent at 6 to 7 per cent. This disturbance in the money market lowered the rate of sterling exchange and depressed the price of United States bonds, but had no effect on speculative stocks, which were not only held up but were advanced. Without doubt, too, it prevented gold from selling as high as it otherwise would have done early in the week. After it became known, however, that the bankers and merchants of New York and the Atlantic cities had resolved to move against the silver scheme, confidence in the defeat of the Bland Bill appeared and the price of gold fell to 102 $\frac{1}{2}$ —or within one-eighth of the lowest price since early in 1862. The efforts to form another coal combination came very near being successful—so near that it is a question whether a combination may not yet be perfected. In London, consols advanced one-half to three-fourths on the improved chances of an armistice. Silver in London was weak, closing at 53 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 53 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per ounce—a price which would make the gold value of the bullion in a 412 $\frac{1}{2}$ -grain silver dollar about 89 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents. At the close the gold value of a United States legal-tender note was \$0.9756.

Our London correspondent describes the political situation in England very fully. The only thing to add to it is that the pro-Turks still hug the theory that the war has been a sort of trial of strength to see which fought best, and the Turk, though defeated,

having shown himself a good fighting-man, ought now be let alone. The Russians themselves are somewhat to blame for the currency of this view by the extraordinary mildness with which they have submitted to Turkish modes of warfare. They flattered and patted Osman Pasha on the back after his surrender, as if he had shown himself a Bayard, although he had not only allowed the Russian wounded, after each assault, to be butchered on the ground, but had refused to permit the burial of the dead, so that when he laid down his arms the hill-sides were covered with Russian skeletons. His defence was no braver or better than scores of Turks have made, not so brave or determined as that of Varna in 1828, and had the Germans taken him after his atrocities they would certainly not have complimented him on his bravery, or sent him to prison with a guard of honor. He fought well, to be sure, but did not Tamerlane and Genghis Khan fight well? Similar weakness on the Russian side was shown at Telis, where, after the first unsuccessful attack, the garrison, to the horror of the two English surgeons who were with them, sallied out and slaughtered the Russian wounded, and in some cases resorted to the playful little Indian trick of lighting fires on the stomachs of living men. The Russian officers knew this when they took the works, and yet restrained their men and allowed the Pasha to surrender his sword instead of knocking him on the head, as Germans or Frenchmen, and most certainly Englishmen, would have done. We are glad to see that Sheket Pasha's failure in the field has been ascribed to the fear of being caught, he having superintended or ordered the massacres at Batak; but he evidently overrates the Russian capacity for honest wrath.

General Gourko, after crossing the Balkans, fought a severe battle on December 31 before Tashkeseu, at the junction of the roads from Orhanie and Zlatitza to Sophia, where the Turks had intrenched themselves. The latter retreated at nightfall. Gourko, who reports a loss of seven hundred killed and wounded, halted for rest and reorganization, and then resumed his march on Sophia. The Russians having received heavy reinforcements from beyond the Balkans, though at a great sacrifice of men perishing or disabled by the cold, the Turkish force which held the position near Komartzi retreated eastward to Zlatitza. From other exposed positions the Turks had gradually withdrawn towards Ikhtiman, midway between Sophia and Tatar Bazarjik in Rumelia, which is becoming a principal point of concentration. On January 2 the Turks made an attempt to surround five battalions of Russian infantry and a brigade of cavalry at Bogrov, about twelve miles east of Sophia, but were driven off after a desperate engagement, leaving a thousand killed on the field, as the Russians report. On the following day Sophia was entered by General Gourko, after a light skirmish before its gates. The city had been completely evacuated. Some days later, the force which had retreated to Zlatitza was, after severe fighting, forced to abandon that place as well as Petritchevo, south of it, and fell back on Poibren and Orlukköl, respectively about ten and twenty miles northeast of Ikhtiman, where they occupied "strong positions."

The unopposed crossing of the Shipka pass by General Radetzki has been reported from Bucharest in an unofficial way, but a telegram from the Turkish camp at the pass contradicts the news. Gourko, meanwhile, may wait for fresh succor, or he may possibly detach some troops to effect a junction with the Servians, who have suffered a severe check in the recapture of Kurshumlie by Turkish troops from Novi-Bazar, after two days' sanguinary fighting. On the plain of Erzerum the Russians, operating on the north bank of the Kara Su, or northern branch of the Euphrates, advanced to the road to Balburt and Trebizond, where it crosses the river near Bidja, northwest of Erzerum, but suffered a disastrous repulse, according to a Reuter telegram—which must be received with caution. Mukhtar Pasha seems to have been recalled, and changes in the command of the Turkish armies in Europe are also reported, including the placing of Suleiman Pasha, as commander of a corps, under Raouf Pasha, as general-in-chief in Rumelia.

THE REPUBLICAN SENATORS AND "HARMONY."

OUR readers may remember that when the late Mr. Jenckes was agitating the question of civil-service reform ten years ago, the great obstacle in the way of any change was the difficulty of producing a bill that would satisfy members of Congress. There was hardly one of them who was not in favor of reform in the abstract. He saw the need of it just as clearly as Jenckes himself, and desired it just as ardently. What troubled him was "the particular measure" of reform then under consideration. He could not for the life of him make up his mind that this or that bill or scheme would supply the desired remedy. It was very soon discovered, too, that there was no use in amending or altering the bill or scheme, or drawing up another, because *any* bill or scheme was sure to prove defective. No "particular measure" would, in short, satisfy the average Congressional reformer, and the reason was that although in other things he was willing to take the world as he found it, and do the best he could with it, in this matter of civil service reform what he sought for was absolute perfection, and this thirst for perfection of course neither Jenckes nor any other man could slake. He would put it to Jenckes whether under the very system then proposed many incompetent and dishonest persons might not make their way into the public service, and poor Jenckes had of course to answer sorrowfully in the affirmative, and this admission brought the discussion for the Congressman to a triumphant close. "Produce me a scheme of reform," he would say, "which will effect an *absolute* purification of the public service, which will fill it with the good and competent, to the exclusion of all others, and you will have no more earnest supporter than myself. Until you do this I prefer to leave the service as it is."

The passion for perfection abated afterwards. At a later period the Congressional reformers began to say that the perfect civil service for which they sighed was, they saw plainly, not to be attained in this world. In a better one they hoped to see it, but not sooner. As far as the United States was concerned, it was a poet's, or student's dream, and they for their part were going to give up striving for it. They would think of it often on the river bank about sunset, and when sitting around the stove before the lamp was lighted, and would be touched by allusions to it in sermons, but they could not give any of their working hours to vain efforts to produce it. As the years rolled on, however, and abuses multiplied and were exposed, they were compelled to admit that something short of a perfect civil service might be desirable and attainable; that is, that improvements in the civil service were possible and ought to be sought. In this condition the Cincinnati Convention found them, and the result was the celebrated fifth resolution, which binds the party to effect certain specific but very radical changes in the mode of appointment and in the conditions of tenure. It is true that during the canvass they tried to divert attention from this resolution, but, as their ill-luck would have it, their candidate took it in sober earnest, and has set to work to carry it out. The problem now under consideration, therefore, is how to prevent the change in the civil service proposed by the Cincinnati platform. It will clearly not do to talk of these changes as a poet's dreams, or as only attainable in a future life among disembodied spirits, because the men who drew the platform, like all members of committees on resolutions, were practical, long-headed men, with sound brains, wide experience, and ready pens. The solution agreed upon is now plain to be seen, viz., to urge the unseasonableness of reform. That is to say, the Republican politician is now as eager for reform as ever, and as fully determined to bring it about, but is this the time for it? Is it expedient to push it at this particular juncture? Clearly not; and the reason is, that what we need most just now is Harmony in the Party, and the reason we need Harmony is that "the Solid South" is marching straight at the Government with the fixed intention of robbing the Treasury and making depreciated silver the standard of value. To undertake civil-service reform under these circumstances would, they say, be madness. They are

not going to *forget* it, if they know themselves, but as practical men they see the necessity of "doing one thing at a time" and doing the most important thing first. Take, for instance, the case of Mr. Dawes, of Massachusetts. His passion for civil-service reform is well known. He has lain awake over that more than any other one thing except the butchery of negroes, which he knows is constantly going on at the South. Now what did he say the other day? Why, that civil-service reform, holy and noble as it was, must be postponed in order to resist the Solid South and the silver movement, and restore Harmony in the Party.

When one enquires into the exact nature of the connection between civil-service reform and Harmony in the Party one comes on some rather startling facts. We are told in plain terms, and apparently with entire unconsciousness of anything singular in the matter, that the Senators, if their share in the patronage is interfered with by the President, will not oppose the silver movement, and will let "the Solid South" have its way, so that when the President tries to appoint a collector whom Mr. Conkling does not like, he becomes morally responsible for the robbery of the Treasury and the repudiation of a portion of the public debt. Mr. Conkling and his Republican colleagues have, it seems, no duty of their own either towards the public credit or the civil service. Their oath of office places no direct responsibility on them whatever. They are bound to behave well and watch over the public interests only in case the President does not annoy them or meddle with them. Should he act injudiciously, their power becomes completely detached from duty, and they are at liberty to make any use of it they please. Nor are they called on to contribute in any degree to Harmony in the Party. Indeed, Harmony seems to consist solely in their having their own way. It is the President's sworn duty under the Constitution to select persons for certain Federal offices, and that of the Senators to advise him as to their fitness, and confirm them if they think proper. It would seem as if his performing this function, however unwisely, ought not to make the smallest change in the responsibility of the Senators as legislators. And yet it does. It destroys it, we are told, altogether. It justifies Mr. Conkling in letting the Solid South and the silver-men do what they please in everything, and in concentrating his whole time and attention on the custom-house of one city and the officers of one State. It even justifies him in total indifference to Harmony, that most terrible condition of the politician's soul. The care of Harmony is now thrown completely on the President, and he is asked every day with curses and execrations when he is going to be harmonious.

We would suggest, apropos of all this, to the bankers of this city and State who have been recently taking counsel, as it is most proper they should, over the silver question and its dangers to public and private business, whether they would not do well to put on record their view of the duty of the New York Senators, at least in a crisis of this kind, in national affairs. No State in the Union is so much interested in legislation regarding the currency and the public credit, and the amount and collection of customs duties, as New York. A very large proportion of the work of exchange with foreign countries is done in this city; so is a very large proportion of the adjustment of domestic accounts, and of the supply of capital for industrial purposes. One, at least, of the Senators ought to be a man sincerely and specially interested in finance, trade, and commerce, and keenly alive to every political movement or drift of opinion which seems likely to affect the currency or credit of the country, or the prosperity of this great port. Have the bankers observed that their "Senior Senator," the only one belonging to the party in power, has not during the last nine months of anxiety and alarm once opened his mouth about the dangers with which the country is threatened by schemes of repudiation and adulteration, or given the smallest sign either in public or private of knowledge of or interest in them? Have they observed that, as far as can be discovered, his brains and passions have been wholly absorbed in the work of keeping, in defiance of the President, a collector of customs in an office which he has held during the most corrupt period in its history,

when it was really used, to all outward appearance, almost as much for the annoyance and repression of commerce as for the collection of revenue? Do they not see that his success in this enterprise, discreditable as it is in itself, cannot but militate against future efficiency and reform, by destroying or greatly weakening the sense of responsibility in the chief officer of the Government, on whom the duty of selecting his subordinates has been specially laid by the Constitution? Can they think of anything more likely to lower the character of the Government and put the public credit in constant peril than the doctrine now preached, that any unwillingness of the President to part with this duty, or share it, justifies a Senator in the total neglect of his legislative functions, and complete indifference to the great financial interests of the nation? And if they see all these things, as we are sure they do, would not a word of solemn protest against this proposed conversion of the Senate into a body of ill-tempered office-jobbers, without honor or responsibility, be a very appropriate addition to their utterances on the proposal to pay the public debt in a depreciated coin?

THE GOVERNOR ON THE CITY.

GOVERNOR ROBINSON, in his message sent to the Legislature last week, calls attention anew to the condition of the government of this city, as we believe every governor has done at the opening of every legislature for the past seven years. The facts of the case, as he puts them, are these: Twenty years ago the embarrassments arising in the municipal administration led to the creation of legislative commissions to control various departments, and in this way nearly all the appropriate powers of the Common Council were finally transferred to the State capitol, until at every session the Senate and Assembly have to a large extent "presented the appearance of a board of aldermen and assistant-aldermen for the city of New York." The result has been disastrous. Within this time upwards of twenty-four hundred laws have been passed relating to the city. These have been in some cases so confused and so conflicting that the Court of Appeals has declared it to be impossible to ascertain their meaning. Of the city debt he estimates that \$85,000,000 was imposed upon it by legislative acts for which the city never applied. He further expresses the opinion that of the twenty-four hundred acts referred to, the majority will be found intended to cover "mere schemes of plunder," or to "change official power from one class of men to another." He then refers to the fact that a number of bills relating to the city were passed by the last Legislature but vetoed by him, either as being unconstitutional, or as containing provisions designed to keep up "the old and corrupt system," and proceeds to enquire, "What now is to be done?" The answer which he gives to this question is remarkable for more reasons than one. He says:

"I am still of the opinion that the only effectual remedy for the evils under which the city suffers will be a careful and well-considered charter in the nature of a constitution, organizing a local government with a strong and responsible executive head; with a city legislature composed of two houses, and clothed with all the powers of local legislation, subject to veto by the mayor. I believe that such a charter may be easily framed, although it would be out of place to attempt to set forth the details of it in this message. When once fully and fairly considered and adopted, it is believed that the advantages of it would be so apparent as to induce steady adherence to it, and to the local government established under it, rather than to return to the dangerous experiment of passing local laws for the city of New York by members of the Legislature, three-fourths of whom know little of the wants of the city."

This proposal is based on the theory that if we can only go back to the point where the ways divided twenty years ago, do away with commissions created within that period, and get a good mayor, all will be well. This is a very favorite scheme of reform with Democrats, but it is open to many objections, the most serious of which is that it has been tried and failed. A good deal may no doubt be done in the way of strengthening the mayor's hands; but so far as the governor's plan involves a local legislature composed of two houses, it is precisely this kind of municipal

government which completely broke down twenty years ago. The Democratic theory is, that about twenty years ago the Republicans, moved by that passion for misgovernment which, according to Democratic ideas, always possesses the "radical" mind, introduced all the present disorder and confusion which we deplore by getting the legislature at Albany to deprive the Aldermen and Common Council of their just authority and vest it in mongrel boards or commissions, which have been doing their best ever since to ruin the city. Hence, all that we have to do to get back to our previous Arcadian condition is to abolish all these bad commissions and go back to what would be called a "good old-fashioned, constitutional city government."

Now, so far from this being the fact, the fact is exactly the opposite. It may be said without hesitation that, whatever advances have been made by this city in the direction of good government within the past generation—and they are neither few nor unimportant—have been due primarily to the fact that power and responsibility have been taken away from the mediæval body which formed the city legislature, and vested in boards having at least the feeling of responsibility which comes from long tenure and from being restricted to a certain definite line of duties. The change in New York within that period has been from an overgrown provincial town, with a village government, to a real city, and a real city, we have found to our cost, cannot be governed by a local legislature, because almost all its government consists of functions which are not legislative. To police a city properly, to guard it from fire, riot, and pestilence, to keep its streets and wharves in good order, requires a certain amount of power well defined and lodged in a few responsible hands. A city legislature of two houses does not possess these qualifications, and never will. Hence their powers have had to be gradually taken away from them and bestowed elsewhere, until to-day the Common Council has been wiped out of existence, and what is left of our legislature has not even power to vote the city taxes, but is supervised when engaged in this work by an appointed board.

There is no reason for believing this steady progress in one direction to have been all wrong. It furnishes a remarkable instance, under our very eyes, of the manner in which institutions decay and disappear when they have lost their vitality. It furnishes, also, a curious instance of the manner in which unlimited suffrage, in the long run, defeats its own ends. One difficulty with the Common Council and Aldermen that begun to be felt a generation ago was the character of the men elected to these bodies, and this has, of course, deteriorated with the extension of the suffrage. But to remedy the evil no attack has been made on the suffrage. The people have gone on voting for a local legislature, year in and year out, as before. The reformers, acting on the old maxim, *Populus vult decipi, decipiat ergo*, have shrewdly permitted the people to vote, but at the same time taken away the powers of those elected by them. In this simple way they have reduced the Aldermen to their present impotence, in which all they seem to be able to do is to obstruct the mayor's nominations, while permitting the people to elect just as many aldermen as ever. Of course this is in effect just as much an interference with the suffrage as if that was directly attacked; but it is easier to go on practising this amiable deception than to face the real question—quietly taking away power from the people's representatives while ostentatiously leaving all power in the hands of the people.

Governor Robinson's proposal, then, is to our mind utterly impracticable, and he seems himself not wholly to believe in his plan; for he recommends also a strong mayor clothed with the veto power. (It is a curious indication of the common feeling underlying all schemes of municipal reform that a strong executive, and not aldermen and councilmen, is what is really needed, that all reformers, however antagonistic on other points, are in favor of increasing the mayor's powers.) He says that the great need of the city is a charter. This is certainly a most remarkable recommendation. A charter is simply a legislative act, clothing the city with certain powers, which the next legislature may change or take away at its

pleasure. There is a charter now, and there has been during all the period of which the Governor complains that it has been one of constantly increasing misgovernment. It is a charter that results in the spectacle of the Albany "Board of Aldermen and Assistant-Aldermen." It is a charter that has produced the twenty-four hundred laws relating to the city; that has made them so confused and conflicting that the Court of Appeals cannot find out what they mean; that imposed a debt of \$85,000,000 upon it; that produced Tweed and Sweeny and Hall and Connolly. A charter is nothing but a device for redistributing the offices, and must be so as long as one legislature can change what another has done. What is wanted is a permanent scheme of government which the legislature cannot interfere with. A charter by its very terms implies a scheme that the legislature can do what it pleases with.

There is another plan before the Legislature which the Governor alludes to, but does not discuss—we mean the plan drawn up by Mr. Tilden's municipal commission. This plan involves, he says, certain "extensive amendments to the constitution"; but he omits to point out how, except by extensive amendments to the constitution, any such permanent improvement in the condition of the government of this city as he desires can be brought about. His silence on the subject cannot but be regarded as very unfortunate, inasmuch as it will be taken as a new indication that the reform which the Democrats profess to be anxious to introduce is nothing more than the possession of the offices by themselves. There is the less excuse in this case, as we understand the Governor was waited upon before the meeting of the Legislature by representatives of the committee engaged in pushing the amendments, who urged upon him the advisability of recommending their passage. The general purport of these amendments has been thoroughly explained by the press and at public meetings. They are simply new and fundamental safeguards in the same direction as the reforms which we have endeavored to point out in this article, and constitute the only solid progress made by the city towards a better system of government. They create a strong executive; they leave in existence the local legislature, but they do not increase its powers. They give the power of appointment in all but two cases to the mayor and aldermen, as at present. They take away the debt-creating power of the city. They bring into existence a new board, which takes the place of the Board of Apportionment in supervising the city budget. The election of this board they put into the hands of tax and rent-payers. There is not a single provision of this scheme which is not in the same direction that all reforms introduced during the last twenty years have been. Yet the entire Democratic party have opposed it from the first, and will try this winter to defeat it as a "Republican" measure. Their ostensible cause of opposition is the new Board of Finance. The election of this board by a restricted suffrage is, they say, an outrage. But it never seems to have occurred to them that, as pointed out above, the effects of popular suffrage may be neutralized in two ways: one by leaving the basis of suffrage what it is and cutting down the power of those elected by it to nothing; the other, by restricting the suffrage itself. The former has been going on for twenty years, not only in this city but in every State in the Union. It goes on whenever the power to create debt is cut down; whenever special legislation of any kind is interfered with. Yet nobody calls it an interference with the suffrage. A conspicuous instance of it in this State took place a year or so ago, when, under Governor Tilden's auspices, two constitutional amendments were adopted taking the power over the canals and over the prisons entirely out of the hands of the people. It will, we have no doubt, continue to go on, wherever legislation, whether local or general, becomes corrupt and bad; and whether it is done in this roundabout way or directly by restricting the suffrage, makes little difference. We could not have a better proof of what a fetish the right of suffrage has become than that the Board of Apportionment should exist without offence, though it has usurped the most ancient privilege of the local legislature, while the Board of Finance is denounced as an aristocratic invention. We may add finally that the most amusing

thing about the opposition to the amendments is the fact that the section which limits the suffrage was last year separated by the legislature from the others, and may be voted on separately; so that the Democratic reformers are placed in the position of denouncing amendments as unpopular which contain a provision permitting the express rejection by the people of the only clause alleged to be displeasing to them. Meanwhile considerable satisfaction is to be derived from the position of the Governor; for it shows that his study of the question has at least brought him face to face with the fact which every year of the city's recent history proves—that we must either go back to the twelfth century for our form of government or go on as we have been going on, protecting ourselves against the evils which the application of that form to a modern city community necessarily engenders.

A SURVIVAL OF LAND COMMUNITY IN NEW ENGLAND.

IT is only a very few years since the attention of English-speaking people was directed to the fact that all ownership in land was collective in early times, and that remnants of this collective ownership have survived in some countries, and in secluded districts of most countries, down to the present day. We pointed out at the time, in a paragraph (see *Nation*, No. 273) which Sir Henry Maine did us the honor to cite in his "Village Communities" (p. 201), that the early settlement of New England was made upon the plan of collective ownership, and that remnants of this survived down to the period of the Revolution. We have since been informed by the Hon. J. H. Trumbull of some very curious instances of the same thing in Connecticut even within the present generation, and we propose now to describe a very remarkable system of land community which still exists upon the island of Nantucket.

In the first place, however, it should be noted—as a Western correspondent pointed out at the time of our former paragraph (see *Nation*, No. 275)—that community of property need not by any means have had the same origin in all cases; and, as we ourselves suggested, the Massachusetts community system may have been merely the natural outgrowth of the circumstances, and not even an involuntary copying of the institutions of Old England. An interesting example of a community in cultivation which might possibly have developed into community of ownership, was afforded by the freedmen of the Sea-Islands of South Carolina during the war. The plantations were the unit at the South; and, except in cases of extreme cruelty and misgovernment, the state of society was in a certain sense patriarchal. When, therefore, the masters departed and the slaves were left to themselves, they did not at once scatter: the plantation, with its semi-patriarchal character, still remained the organic unit, even in the absence of the proprietor; the Northern superintendent serving as a bond of union in his stead. The system of cultivation was that of two fields. (In the village communities of Europe the three-field system was the common one.) The two great fields into which each plantation was divided were alternately planted with cotton or corn, and left fallow. The freedmen in a dim way conceived that the plantation belonged to them collectively, and each year a fresh assignment of land was made to each of them, of the field in cultivation. Here there was no fixed proportion or *hyde*; each head of a family took as much land as he chose to cultivate—so many *tasks*, a term quite analogous to *jugum*, *morgen*, or *ox-gang*. Neither was the cultivation for themselves, but for the proprietor or lessee. But it is easy to conceive that a plantation might have been bid in by its own occupants at a sale of confiscated property (as was done in some cases), and, instead of being divided up, carried on upon this system on their own account. They would have elected their old driver, or some other leader of their own number, as *starosta*, and a system have grown up quite like that prevailing in the Danubian principalities.

To return to Nantucket. This island was originally granted to a company of men, like other New-England towns; only, instead of speedily dividing it up, they developed a most complicated system of community, both of ownership and of cultivation, which still exists in all its integrity, although confined now to a very small number of people, and a very small portion of the island. There are at the present day something less than a dozen persons who possess perfect rights in the common land of the island; but there is only one man living, Mr. Alfred Swain, who understands the system and knows what these rights are.

Nantucket was settled in 1602, by the method usual in New-England towns. A company of twenty-seven proprietors owned all the land of the island, except *Quaise*, a patch of about 130 acres, retained by a former

proprietor. Each proprietor had a right to take up 45 acres as a house-lot, and this was done from time to time, according to convenience or caprice; only a few years ago a claim of 10 acres was made on this account. Until 1717 the company of proprietors were the town; in that year each organization was made distinct, and thenceforward the proprietors, or commoners, were a sort of aristocracy, distinct from the body of towns-people. They have their own records, and continue to have proprietors' meetings, distinct from the town meetings.

In all this Nantucket differs from other old New-England towns only in the late date to which the distinction of commoners was preserved. The development in other respects has been very different. In the other towns they proceeded at once to set off land in full property to the different townsmen—a bit here and a bit there, according as they severally desired meadow, wood-land, bog-land, etc.—until the whole was taken up. In Nantucket, however—as in the village communities of the Old World—the house-lots were the only pieces of land owned by individuals, and other tracts set off for agricultural purposes were still held and cultivated in common. The first tract thus set off was *Shammo* (120 acres, about 1717. The method now adopted appears to have been followed in all subsequent divisions. The 27 shares were measured off and staked off permanently, but without the privilege of fencing off. But subdivisions of shares, which had now become the rule, were not recognized at all, except by the coparceners among themselves, by private agreement. From time to time other districts were set off in the same way, of various extent—*Warehouse Lots*, containing only 64 rods; *Swamps*, 524 acres and 119 rods; and so on—*Fish Lots*, *Beach Lots*, *Squam*, *Southeast Quarter*, etc. In this last division, and perhaps in others, each share consisted of two separate lots, the object being to balance bad land by good. In this division each share (divided and staked off) contains about 90 acres, so that each of the later sub-divisions of *sheep's commons*, to be described presently, contained about one-sixth of an acre in this part of the island—held in undivided severalty with the other proprietors of the share.

Meantime the shares were divided and subdivided, until in 1778 a new arrangement was made. Each of the 27 shares was now divided into 720 "sheep's commons"—49,440 in all. From this time, therefore, the *sheep's common* is the unit of proprietary rights, but it is only an ideal division. The shares, 27 in each district, have been actually surveyed and set off, and are easily known by their numbers: the sheep's commons have never been set off, but the proprietors—be they many or few—of the 720 (or 636) sheep's commons in any share are the proprietors in common of that share. The proprietor of any single sheep's common, therefore, only knows that his proprietary rights are in share No. 12 or 13, and so on, in every district on the island.

The ownership is as complicated as possible. In 1820 there were 322 proprietors, some owning entire shares or even more, and others varying amounts, such as $5\frac{1}{4}$, $179\frac{1}{2}$ sheep's commons (a cow's commons, by the way, was reckoned equal to 8 sheep's commons); and the owner of a sheep's common was proprietor of one undivided nineteen thousand four hundred and fortieth part of each one of some twenty divisions—including such as the 64 rods of *Warehouse Lots* and about 2,500 acres of *Southeast Quarter*, besides general proprietary rights over the undivided parts of the island.

In 1813 another complication was added. A number of proprietors desired to have their shares in severalty, and obtained a decree from the Supreme Court to that effect. The district known as *Plainfield* was therefore set off to these parties as the equivalent of their rights in the undivided parts of the island; they still retained their rights in the divided parts, such as *Squam*, *Shammo*, and *Southeast Quarter*. But in the subsequent divisions, made in 1820 and 1821—*Middle Pastures*, *North Pastures*, *Smooth Hummocks*, *Head of Plains*, *Woods and Lower Plains*, *Trot's Hill*, and *Maddequet and Great Neck*—the shares were divided into 636 instead of 720 sheep's commons each. In these seven districts, therefore, a sheep's common is $\frac{1}{12}$ of the whole; a full proprietor of a sheep's common at the present day (worth about \$2 50 in the market), owns, besides whatever land he may have in severalty, this fraction of these seven districts and $\frac{1}{12}$ of the twenty (or thereabouts) older districts, besides numerous other scattered and ill-defined rights. Most proprietors have, however, divested themselves of some portion of their proprietary rights. Since *Plainfield* was set off the community has been rapidly dissolving.

The cultivation of these tracts was determined from year to year by vote of the proprietors. In the year 1724-5, 13th day of the eleventh month, the records say:

"Voted and agreed that the propriety will lay out a general field for

planting this year. It is voted and agreed that Mattakit shall be the general planting field for ye year ensuing.

"Voted that John Barnard, John Coffin, and Jethro Starbuck shall lay out the said Mattakit into shares, and to order where ye fence to inclose ye same shall stand."

It will be seen that this division was merely temporary; *Maddequet* was not permanently set off until 1821. In 1726 the *North Pasture* was set off "for the space and term of ten years"; in 1821 it was laid out permanently. Jan. 24, 1746:

"Voted that *Squam* land be laid out for mowing for six years, to be mowed but once a year."

Squam was permanently divided in 1778. Jan. 16, 1754:

"Voted that *Squam* be stocked this year."

The same year two acres to a share were planted with turnips.

In the early part of this century it appears to have become a practice to plant one of the seven great divisions each year, by turn, with corn, and the next year with oats, letting it then remain fallow for five years. After these districts were permanently divided, however, in 1820-1, this system went out of use, and a rage for sheep-raising set in. The land indeed had been ruined for agricultural purposes already, because under the system of community it was no man's interest to manure his land or seed it down, and the ocean winds sweeping over the dry stubble blew all the soil into the sea. Sheep-raising too was a failure, because of a conflict that soon set in between the owners of sheep and the owners of sheep's commons; and for some years these once fertile fields have been bare stretches of scrubby grass.

BEACONSFIELD'S LATEST "SURPRISE."

LONDON, December 25, 1877.

CHRISTMAS is upon us again, and it does not promise to be either a very merry Christmas or a happy New Year. In nearly every department of life, except the legal, which generally prospers when the other departments are in adversity, the prospect is gloomy. Trade is depressed, wages are low; there is great suffering among the poor; many farmers are either insolvent or are compelled to ask for time and for reduction of rent; shopkeepers are complaining of the past and looking doubtfully into the future; no one, in short, is satisfied, except some lawyers and professional men on fixed incomes, who are rather better off relatively to others when money is not plentiful in the country. At present, however, there is no scarcity of money. There is plenty of that commodity lying almost idle, or at very low rates of interest. But people are afraid to lay it out. I do not remember any occasion when there was such a long-protracted want of enterprise in this country. Money, though not actually put away in stockings or hidden in the ground, is for commercial purposes practically hoarded. Men go down to their counting-houses day after day, but they are not nerved up to enterprise. There is an apathy and a distrust which is almost universal just now. There is none of the freshness and vigor of a spring morning about people's purposes. It is all gloom and dullness, like a muggy November afternoon. Now, what is the explanation of this apathy and distrust and purposelessness which is so unusual in British commerce? No doubt there are a great many contributory causes, such as the glutted markets produced by the prosperous times of 1872 and 1873, and the recklessness produced among the citizen and working classes by the high wages of those years. The war contributes, the state of commerce and trade in America contributes, the cruel harvest season we have had, and the almost total failure of the crops—all these agencies contribute. But one of the main causes, in my opinion, is the existence of Lord Beaconsfield and his insane passion for "surprises." Ever since he came into office we have been in a perpetual state of tension and uncertainty. We never know from one week's end to another what he would be at. He is always doing something startling or threatening something mischievous—not openly and in a manly English way, but in a crooked and enigmatic way. For two years of his administration, when Europe was at peace, and when we in this country were recovering from the excessive zeal of Mr. Gladstone's home policy, we were only amused by Mr. Disraeli's extravaganzas. They were, comparatively with his later exploits, harmless, and they did not especially commit us to anything risky. We were rich then, and fat, and well liking, and inclined to be genial all round. He amused rather than alarmed us. But since the complications in the East have assumed a serious aspect, and Lord Beaconsfield permits his erratic genius to wander over the dangerous places of Oriental diplomacy, we feel that we are

getting out of the department of farce and entering on that of melodrama or even tragedy. He takes every opportunity of unsettling all our calculations. Whenever any of his colleagues announces to the world that our intentions are honorable and peaceful, and we begin to breathe and settle down to our usual work with thankfulness that Lord Beaconsfield is not omnipotent in his Cabinet, he does something eccentric to show us that our thankfulness is premature.

The last card he has been playing is a very risky one, but he has played it with his usual sang-froid. It is his undoubted influence with the Queen. At a most critical time in the Eastern imbroglio a new volume of the 'Life of the Prince Consort' is published, if not by authority, certainly with the sanction, of the Queen. The Prime Minister was undoubtedly aware that this book was on the point of being published, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he was consulted as to the propriety of giving some of the more private opinions and letters of the Prince and of the Queen to the public. Now, this volume treats almost exclusively of the period of the Crimean war. These opinions were formed and these letters were written at a time when we were at war with Russia, when all the worst passions in human nature were aroused against her, when every act of Russia was construed with the determination to see her in the worst light, when people's judgment was not, strictly speaking, upon the balance, and when to those motives for jealousy and hatred of Russia there was superadded a feeling of alarm at the critical state in which our small army was left in the Crimea, and our not unfounded distrust in the stability of the French alliance. It would have been impossible to have formed any but an unjust estimate of Russia and her designs at that time, or at least a very unfriendly estimate. I am no admirer either of Russia or of her policy, and I have not hesitated to express my views upon both in the letters which I have sent you from time to time. But I cannot but consider it indiscreet to select this particular moment, when the relations between this country and Russia are notoriously strained, for the publication of a series of letters and memoranda from the most important people in this country such as this volume contains. It is unfortunate that a book which really is almost a manifesto against a nation with whom we are at peace, but with whom our relations are in a state of tension, should be published avowedly with the Queen's sanction and probably with the approval of the Prime Minister. Following upon that publication comes a series of *communiqués* to the press regarding frequent visits paid by Lord Beaconsfield to Windsor, and then a sudden announcement that the Queen was going to take the unusual, the almost unprecedented, course of paying a visit to her Prime Minister at his country seat. The Queen has only paid four visits to her Prime Ministers since she came to the throne in 1837, and none of them, if I am rightly informed, were made either in the dead of winter or when critical events were impending. And people are still wondering at the meaning of this unusual proceeding on the part of the Queen, and shaking their heads doubtfully over it, when a more startling announcement is made with equal unexpectedness, and that is, that after two or three Cabinet councils following with unusual rapidity one after the other, Parliament has been suddenly summoned to meet for the transaction of business on the 17th of January, or three weeks before the usual time. We cannot but ask what all this means.

There may be nothing whatever in the Queen's civility towards Lord Beaconsfield beyond her desire to gratify an old servant of the Crown in the way which she must know pleases him best, namely, by appealing to his vanity and his sense of the histrionic. This would be in keeping with her habitual demeanor since she came to the throne, because, though both she and her late husband have often been unjustly accused of intermeddling in party politics, these accusations have always been disproved, and her kindness and tact in dispensing her marks of good will towards her ministers have ever been remarkable, and no mark of good will could be so pleasing to Lord Beaconsfield as such an attention as she showed him last week. But be this as it may, the time was inopportune. It is known far and wide that the foreign policy of the Prime Minister is hostile, or would be if it had full play, to Russia, and it is believed that if he had his will we should be at war with Russia all along the line from the Himalayas to the Baltic. It is known that there is a war party and a peace party in the Cabinet, and that they are very nearly balanced. It surely was injudicious in the Queen, and culpable in Lord Beaconsfield if he advised her, to give even the semblance of approval or preference to one policy over the other. However, it has been given by these recent transactions, and the effect has been very serious in the country. In London there has been a war-scare since the announcement that Parliament is to meet so soon, in commercial circles a new element

of uncertainty has been thrown like a bomb-shell upon a quiet household that had already been heavily bombarded, and throughout the country an unhealthy excitement has been produced which prevents people from settling down contentedly to their regular work. All this coming on the top of serious commercial depression has had a bad effect in all circles. It would be a curious financial calculation to discover how many millions sterling must be written off against Mr. Disraeli's insatiable propensity for "surprises." What has the gratification of his vanity cost the commerce of Great Britain during the latter years of his active life? What this new exhibition of political fireworks means none of us, of course, can understand. There are a thousand and one rumors and surmises. I have tried to sift the more likely of them, and the conclusion I have come to respecting the early meeting of Parliament is this: that the Cabinet are at sixes and sevens, and that they have, by way of a compromise between a declaration of war and absolute neutrality, determined to ask Parliament for a large sum of money in order to put this country in a state of preparation for war if Russia should make any extravagant demands (which is unlikely), or if she should wish to conclude a treaty with Turkey which might seriously affect our interests without consulting us; and if the House of Commons should refuse to grant the necessary supplies, the Government is prepared to appeal to the country on the issue, not of peace or war, but of the refusal of the House to grant supplies for preparation. If this is all that is meant, I can only say that there has been a great deal of unnecessary mystery about the whole business. The House will probably grant the supplies, but the policy of the Government will be subjected to sharp criticism, and a strict vigilance will be exercised upon the expenditure of every farthing of the sum of money granted.

Correspondence.

THE RECENT AWAKENING OF CAPITALISTS AND THE NATION'S PREDICTION IN 1874.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On the 17th December, 1874, the *Nation* closed a series of articles on the dangers of inflation with the following prediction:

"If, through the inaction of the business world, inflation should be forced upon this country in 1878, which is the earliest time at which it can be put in motion, three results would probably follow. [Among them . . .] the business community would be aroused into doing what can be done much more easily now. The only credits would be gold credits, the only loans gold loans, the only bank discounts those of gold notes."

Turning back to the articles, I find that on the 6th of August the *Nation*, reviewing the causes which had made Western inflationists, used the following language:

"The West, which is always a borrower, was not slow to perceive that loans could be readily procured to carry on its speculative enterprises. It was also clearly enough perceived that fresh dilutions would make it all the easier to repay the nominal amount borrowed. So far as the hand-to-hand transactions of daily life were involved, the fluctuations of paper were comparatively unimportant; but when it came to 'time transactions,' where the rise or fall of paper might exceed all reasonable calculation, business probity required that the real value of the thing loaned should be definitely settled and mutually understood. Instead of this, the lender, as a rule, speculated upon the chances of paper approximating to gold before the debt should mature, and the borrower speculated upon the chances, first, that he would make a great deal of money out of his venture, and, second, that if he did not, inflation would come along and tide him over the bar of payment. He was thus educated to be an inflationist, and a hundred other men looking on at the same time were taught the same lesson."

Having thus shown how the business community by dealing in paper-money for "time transactions" was responsible for the West, and indeed for all borrowers, being inflationists, the *Nation* proceeded to show the complete remedy which the business community held in its own hands, and to demonstrate that financial safety required that this remedy should be put immediately into operation (*Nation*, 13th August, 1874):

"The inflationists do not seem to understand that the Supreme Court has expressly decided that we have in this country two kinds of 'lawful money,' and that the American people are free to deal in whichever they please. Further than this, the Supreme Court has given a valuable practical effect to its decision by holding that where the contract is made payable in one of these kinds of money—that is to say, in gold—the judgment in a suit upon such a contract must be rendered for gold, and the sheriff must satisfy the execution by paying the judgment creditor the full amount in gold. For such contracts there is, in contemplation of law, no paper money in existence. There is, therefore, in every man's hands a final remedy against inflation. All that is necessary to make this remedy effective is to make it operative. If any person can doubt this, he has

only to glance at the Pacific communities, where the resolute will of the people has kept paper out of circulation as completely as though it were forbidden by the Constitution of the United States. There are no inflationists there; for every man, no matter how much he may want money made easy, knows that a nominal dollar cannot be legislated into a real dollar, and that a real dollar cannot be liquidated by a nominal dollar, and that if he borrows the latter it will be worth no more to him than he can sell it for at a broker's. . . . The error of capitalists, and indeed of the entire business community, has been that they were willing to speculate upon the supposed progress of contraction, and have so managed financial matters that every 'time transaction' has been a bribe to the debtor to be for the time an inflationist. If New York, Philadelphia, and Boston were to agree that all loans and credits henceforth are to be in gold and for gold, a borrowing community like Indiana would speedily change front and be heard declaring that irredeemable government notes are little better than their former 'wild-cat' currency, and that the interests of the West demand that paper must be put up to gold."

And again on the 17th December, 1874, the *Nation* said:

"Whenever this right [the right of the business community to deal in coin] is decisively exercised—not in the daily hand-to-hand affairs of life, where it would be found inconvenient and ineffective, and where the law that the poorer money will drive out the better holds true, but in all 'time transactions,' whenever a loan is made or a credit given—then the premium will be shifted from inflation to resumption, and the game which our demagogues now find it easy to play will become a losing one. So long as men accumulate money by work and thrift, and lend it to men who, when they borrow it, expect with the aid of Congress to return but half of it, just so long we are helping and in fact bargaining to perpetuate, the present evils. So long, too, as the business world goes on ignoring the coin in which it may if it pleases exclusively trade, just so long it is teaching the less informed portion of the people that gold and silver need not exist. . . . Is it not time for our Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade to begin to assert that the accumulating industry of the country has in fact the power to force resumption, just as the people of California forced a gold circulation?"

These admonitions of the *Nation* were commented on by other papers and talked over in business circles, and the facts and the remedy were as well understood in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston on the 1st January, 1875, as on the 1st January, 1878. What did the business men of these cities do? Just what might have been expected. They allowed their ship to drift as it had been drifting; they continued to speculate "upon the chances of paper approximating to gold," and they embarked in new enterprises for lending Western borrowers all the paper money they wanted on mortgage securities, whereby it is safe to say there are now more individual debtors on "time transactions" in the West than ever before. Having thus steadily sown the wind for three years, they now see something which looks like a whirlwind coming down upon them in 1878, "which is the earliest time at which it could be put in motion"; and they also see that under their constant teaching the South and West are not only more strongly inflationist than ever before, but are strong enough to carry silver inflation over the President's veto, certainly in one House and possibly in both. Amid these (long-foretold) circumstances the business community awakened to the fact that business "probity" requires that business shall be done on a gold basis, and make an appeal to the country against the impending silver inflation upon moral grounds which they have been themselves constantly disregarding.

Respectfully, etc., etc.,

C. C. N.

WASHINGTON, January 8, 1878.

FORESEEING THE DECLINE OF SILVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Mr. Halstead's letter on the demonetization of silver, published in your last number, there is a curious evasion of one of the points made by you in your article "Why the Demonetization of Silver did not Attract Popular Attention." Mr. Halstead quotes from your article these words:

"But, then, it is said that the Demonetization Act was a speculative measure. The men who 'engineered' it knew silver was going to fall, and therefore determined to get it out of the way as a legal tender for the benefit of the bondholders who desired payment in gold. How could they know?"

I understand from this passage, as well as from the numerous articles published in the *Cincinnati Commercial* and other journals which advocate the Bland Bill, that the men who "engineered" the Coinage Act are accused of having foreseen the fall in the value of silver, and having therefore brought about its demonetization in order to save the holders of Government securities as well as other creditors, both public and private, from the necessity of accepting the prospectively cheap metal in payment of their claims. But Mr. Halstead proceeds to answer your ques-

tion as to how they could have known that silver was going to fall by saying that the "money-changers" and "experts" knew it because they knew that the demonetized metal would depreciate from the very fact of its demonetization: in other words, they knew silver was going to fall because they intended to make it fall. This is a change of base. The silver-men have been telling us that the "money-changers" demonetized silver because they foresaw its fall. You ask how could they have foreseen it? Now Mr. Halstead slips away from under your query and triumphantly answers from his new-found position: "They foresaw its fall because they demonetized it."

You have well shown in your comments on Mr. Halstead's letter that as the causes which operated to produce the decline in the value of silver did not begin to work until two years after the Coinage Act of 1873, the decline could not have been foreseen, and, in fact, no one has undertaken to show how or why it could have been foreseen. But there is another answer to Mr. Halstead's argument. If the "money-changers" or "experts," whom he accuses of having brought about the demonetization of silver, did so because they desired to appreciate one metal at the expense of the other, why did they not demonetize gold and thus appreciate still more that metal which was already the more valuable? In 1873 the silver dollar was worth three cents more than the gold dollar; silver was therefore much the more favorable metal for the "money-changers" to retain, because part of the desired appreciation already existed in that metal. Probably the answer will be made that the "money-changers" and "experts," in their omniscience, foresaw the increased yield in the American mines; and yet, whenever the accusation is made that the silver movement was initiated by men who are interested in working off this increased product of silver, we are told that those same mines yield as much or more gold than silver. Are not the champions of the "dollar of the fathers" very like the Dutchman's flea?

In conclusion let me say that, although it is unfortunately true that the majority of the Western people have been led astray by such blind guides as the *Cincinnati Commercial* and *Chicago Tribune*, there are nevertheless a good many of us who regret and deplore this movement, which, if successful, will deprive us not only of a single gold standard but even of a double metallic standard, and commit us to a single standard of silver or a double standard of silver and paper, and must work infinite mischief to the finances and business of the country.

J. D. B.

CINCINNATI, December 31, 1877.

THE CUSTOM-HOUSE IN THE BOSTON ELECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I observe that in a paragraph of your issue of yesterday concerning the late election here you "regret to see that in order to secure this result [the election of Pierce] they [the Republicans and Independents] were forced to call in the aid of a machine on their own side—*sc.*, the Custom-house." I think the Citizens' Committee, representing the convention which nominated Mr. Pierce, would, in common with the great body of our citizens, be glad to know your authority for this statement.

From a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the management of the campaign, I think myself authorized to deny that either Mr. Pierce or the Citizens' Committee asked for aid from the Custom-house. If Mr. Simmons or any person in the employ of the United States Government exerted themselves in behalf of the election of Mr. Pierce, they did it without solicitation from any one who had a right to speak for the Citizens' Committee or its candidate.

W. E. PERKINS.

Boston, December 22, 1877.

[The sentence quoted by our correspondent was immediately followed by this one: "If we may believe the Democratic papers, the civil-service order was found not to interfere with a great deal of 'legitimate political activity' on the part of the 'boys,' who 'peddled Republican tickets' at a great rate." The two stood and were intended to stand in strict connection.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

THE Riverside Edition of the British Poets (Hurd & Houghton) now includes Shelley's Works in two volumes, or about twelve hundred pages, reduced in price like the rest of the series.—The discovery of a hitherto unknown romance, "The Journal of Julius Rodman," by Edgar A. Poe, has been reported in the English literary weeklies; whereas the

writing in question is not a romance, and appeared thirty-five years ago in Burton's *Gentleman's Magazine*. It is a bald résumé of the various explorations of the Rocky Mountains up to the year 1842, and introduces a few characters of a proposed romance which was never carried further.

—A novelty in New England pedigrees is announced to be published by David Clapp & Son, Boston, viz., 'An Indian Genealogy, including seven generations in descent from the chieftain Massasoit,' composed by Gen. Ebenezer W. Peirce from the lips of Mrs. Zerviah Gould Mitchell, of North Abington, Mass., who is of the seventh generation aforesaid.—The Alumni Association of Haverford College, Penn., offer a prize of \$250 (or £50) for the best essay on "The most practicable plan for promoting the speedy substitution of judicial for violent methods of settling 'international disputes.'" Essays must be submitted during the present year.—In addition to what we have already remarked about Bulletin No. 6 of the Harvard College Library, we may notice its detailed statement of book funds, from which it appears that the library had, when the Bulletin was published, \$11,775 to spend annually for books, with a surplus of \$3,000 for contingencies. This has been since increased by the Sever bequest of \$20,000. The library proposes to publish a catalogue of scientific serials, prepared by Mr. Samuel H. Scudder, which will include society transactions and independent journals in every branch of natural, physical, and mathematical science, excluding only the applied sciences, medicine, agriculture, technology, etc. It will extend to about 300 pages, and be delivered bound for \$4. Some numbers printed only on one side of the leaf for catalogue purposes will be sold in sheets for \$5. The list will be double in extent any at present existing.—A new publishers' advertising sheet, D. Lothrop & Co.'s, Boston, has something interesting and pleasant. Besides a classed list of the more important publications in the United States from September to December 1, arranged on the Dewey or Amherst plan, it prints notices of books by well-known writers. The *Book Bulletin* is issued quarterly for a small subscription price.—Baron Mueller, at the request of the Victorian Government, has prepared (primarily for the use of schools) an introductory work on the botany of Australia, "in which he groups together in their respective families the most remarkable species for consideration, and also gives much useful information respecting their industrial and medicinal properties." Tree-cultivators everywhere might find this work suggestive.—A new edition has just been published in Paris of Robert-Houdin's 'Comment on devient Sorcier,' which has been out of print for eight years. This is the work which Mr. Hoffmann has recently translated.—Mr. Lewes's essays on 'Actors and Acting' is now accessible to American readers in the handy Tauchnitz edition.

—By rare good fortune a few copies of a privately printed volume of great interest and value have been placed on sale—with Henry Holt & Co., in this city, with Little, Brown & Co., in Boston, and with Charles W. Sever, in Cambridge. We refer to 'Letters of Chauncey Wright, with some Account of his Life,' by James Bradley Thayer (Cambridge, 1878). In noticing the collection of Wright's 'Philosophical Discussions,' edited last year by Professor Norton (New York: Henry Holt & Co.), we remarked that it "contains, we suppose, the only remains of its remarkable author which will ever be given to the public." In this we were, happily, mistaken, and the monument is now completed by an act of friendship which, while still leaving Chauncey Wright to speak for himself, permits him to be known and esteemed as his public writings were quite incapable of making him. We advise all who own the weightier and formal volume to add to it this familiar view of the man, his daily occupation, the delightful circle in which he lived, the acute minds with which he conversed. The editing has been done with admirable discrimination and skill, and the book (from the press of John Wilson & Son) has a transatlantic beauty and solidity.

—We have received another letter from Mr. Ward Nichols about the awards in the Art Group at the Exposition, and forwarded it to General Walker, who has written a rejoinder. As both communications consist mainly of naked confutations, and as we have no machinery for trying issues of fact, we think these gentlemen will excuse our declining to print them, or any thing more on the same subject. We are quite sure the controversy in its present stage would have no interest for the public.

—A correspondent writes us from Indiana:

"A recent issue of the *Nation* commented on the amount of money loaned by insurance companies and other Eastern institutions on landed security at the West, and spoke of it as a thing likely to do good there. To an observer on the ground the most immediate and noticeable effect is to carry each and every person so effecting a loan over to the side of repudiation, whether to be accomplished in whole or in part by silver or by greenbacks.

"The rate of interest charged cannot be made by farming. The loan, therefore, is a lasso swung for the land. The wisdom of the venture should take into consideration the poverty of the community, indicated by the extent of the aggregate loan, the high rate of taxation which has taken all mobility out of land, the effect on the market of so large an amount of land subject to sale; and last, not least, the capacity of a Western man to damage a farm from ownership of which he has been evicted—the landlord being a non-resident. If waste should ever be made a science, the facts for its treatment can be collected at the West.

"As shrewd a thing as Eastern investors could do would be to convert their 10 per cent. currency loans into 5 per cent. gold loans payable at the usual five-year term. That would take the borrower over to the hard-money camp. It is in vain to tell a Western farmer that he is, and always has been, at specie payments, and must so continue while the country's surplus is sold in a gold market. He handles greenbacks, thinks it a question of proportion, and don't or won't understand that he pays the insurance on a redundant and fluctuating currency. But he perfectly understands that a contract made in a standard of high value and liquidated in one of low value puts money in his pocket, and the reverse process in that of the loaner. Not a little of the hostility felt by the borrowing class to the East grows out of the belief that the latter game is being played with them, that they are to be the losers; and then they chuckle to think that votes will turn the tables."

—We find in the Boston *Daily Advertiser* an announcement of a projected attempt at special legislation which for impudence cannot be surpassed even by the Texas-and-Pacific job. That purely personal enterprise known as the Woodruff Expedition having utterly failed to persuade the public that any good to science could accrue from its mob of tourists committed to a preposterous programme, and having obtained neither ship, passengers, nor scientific staff, now seeks to use the Government in order to buy a ship more cheaply, to secure a scientific staff without cost to Woodruff and his associates, and to give the speculation the air of a national undertaking, under cover of which it is hoped the scheme will not miscarry a second time. According to the *Advertiser* (which, with characteristic lack of humor, thinks the only obstacle hitherto has been the "difficulties in procuring a suitable ship"), the "managers and friends" of the expedition got Senator McDonald, before the recess, to introduce a bill authorizing them for the purposes of the expedition exclusively to register an English or German ship, and sail her under the American flag, and "detailing officers of the army and navy, not more than five of each, for duty with the expedition, who are to be required to send detailed reports to their respective departments, and make collections, scientific and other, for the National Museum." This bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and is to be brought up for early action. It merits the same kind and amount of consideration as would a bill authorizing Barnum to import an Egyptian obelisk free of duty, and detailing army and navy officers to attend to its transportation, and write reports on its hieroglyphics, and make dredgings from the caisson *en route* across the Atlantic, and take the tickets at the Hippodrome after the stone had been set up for exhibition.

—M. Octave Feuillet is a playwright who never offends the taste, but whose plays are so quiet, not to say tame, as to require exceptionally good acting to prevent their becoming tedious. In the "Man of Success," now on the stage at the Union Square Theatre, there are no less than six acts, and yet no great amount of action. The plot turns on the development of a type of character favorite with dramatists and novelists of a certain class—the hard-hearted, unprincipled man of the world, who succeeds in everything he undertakes, but whose means of success will not bear examination. Sometimes he has a redeeming trait, sometimes not. In the present play he is very much attached to his children, though, as he seems to have no other human affection, this paternal tenderness does not seem the most natural thing in the world. He has been, as a matter of fact, a great rascal, having obtained his wealth by a fraud deliberately practised upon his partner in business, who had shot himself under the false impression produced by the misrepresentations of Raoul that he was a beggar. The son of the suicide, however, George Sorel, the "man of success" brings up and treats with great kindness, looking forward to a marriage between his daughter and the young man. Everything begins now to go wrong, chiefly, it must be confessed, because the misguided man of success determines to "enter the political arena." His enemies get hold of the real history of his partnership affairs and raise the "cry of fraud." Troubles with his wife also begin; his children discover his true character; he fights a duel with and wounds young Sorel, between whom and his daughter there is no longer any concealment as to the state of their affections; his friends desert him, and he is hurried out of his own house lest his daughter, reviving from a fainting fit, shall see in her father the murderer of her lover. It is hardly necessary perhaps for those who know the peculiar tenderness of M.

Feuillet's disposition to describe the end of the play. The lover is not killed at all, the father is converted at the last, and a happy reconciliation and marriage crown the whole. It is all highly improbable, highly romantic, undeniably "genteel," and a little dull. The French moral intended to be conveyed is the redeeming influence of parental affection: to an American audience that most likely to be drawn would be the danger of successfully sustained "charges" brought against a candidate during an excited campaign. Mr. Coghlan's acting is good, though to our mind a little too stiff. Mr. Polk, as the Peruvian adventurer, is so perfect that it is a pity more was not made of the part by the author. The play, of course, suffers in the hands of English-speaking actors, and in French must be very much better. It will hardly prove as successful, however, in the long run as "The Romance of a Poor Young Man."

—The *North American* for January-February contains, among its principal articles, a eulogy on Charles Sumner by Senator Hoar: the first instalment of a series of papers on Dramatic Composition, by Dion Boucicault; a chapter from Lecky's forthcoming work, a 'History of England in the Eighteenth Century,' on the English aristocracy; and a paper on the origin of the Italian language, by W. W. Story. It is needless to say that Mr. Hoar's opinion of Mr. Sumner is a high one—so high that he does not shrink from lauding his subject's ability as a "jurist." He says that Mr. Sumner was "a zealous student of that branch, or rather, we should say, of that main trunk of the science of jurisprudence which is somewhat inexactly called by some writers the 'Law of Nature,'" and adds that if he had gone to Cambridge in 1845, and succeeded his friend and teacher, Story, "he would have completed the task which Mackintosh left unfinished." Mr. Hoar defines the "Law of Nature" as follows:

"This science, first declaring the great fundamental principles of morality, which are applicable to the whole private and public conduct of men, then determines the limitation of the authority of the state, speaking through its legislature or judicial tribunals, in compelling that application; then deduces from these principles the rules which should govern men in their transactions and controversies with each other, whether these transactions and controversies arise between independent nations or between private citizens. Its pursuit requires the study of the great writers on ethics, on the law of nations, maritime and commercial law."

This is a tolerably wide field, and a dangerous one, as may be seen (if not otherwise) from the difficulty Mr. Hoar discovers in defining it. But we cannot believe that there is much reason for supposing that Mr. Sumner as a teacher of this or any other kind of law would ever have made a success. His notions as to the functions of what he was fond of calling a "jurist" indicate this pretty clearly. Mr. Hoar quotes from his eulogy on Story a contrast between the lawyer and judge on the one hand and the "jurist" on the other. "All ages," he says, "have abounded in lawyers and judges. There is no churchyard that does not contain their forgotten dust. But the jurist is rare. . . . The jurist is higher than the lawyer, as . . . Washington is more exalted than the Swiss, who, indifferent to cause, barter for money the vigor of his arm and the sharpness of his spear." This is not quoted with approval, but we are surprised that any friend of Mr. Sumner's reputation should reproduce it at all; for it proves an absolute failure on his part to comprehend the subject with which he was dealing. The "jurist"—this ideal character, who is not a lawyer or a judge, and who knows law not as it is found in the records of decided cases, or in constitutions or statutes, but as it may be supposed to exist in its pure essence—is a creation of the mind, who never has existed and fortunately never will exist. We say fortunately, because we can imagine nothing more detrimental to the best interests of society, to the safety of property, reputation, and life, than the spread of the idea that we can learn what law or justice is by going to professors of the "Law of Nature" instead of to the judges and advocates in whose hands in every generation is the administration of the only actual systems of rights and duties which we know anything about.—Mr. John Fiske contributes an article called "A Crumb for the 'Modern Symposium,'" which may be read with profit by those who are frightened at the ravages "materialism" is supposed to be making in modern philosophy. He declares that in his opinion this philosophy, "as represented by Spencer and Huxley, not only affords no support to materialism, but condemns it utterly, and drives it off the field altogether."

—Necrologically speaking, 1877 has been generally treated by the press as an "off-year," and doubtless the sudden quenching of splendid names has been more striking and impressive in former years. Among rulers, the Queen of Netherlands was the only one of note who died in the midst

of her reign, unless we except Brigham Young and his *imperium in imperio*. Thiers seemed to lose a possible return to power together with his life, but we can now rejoice that the opportunity did not come, and perceive how well able France was to spare him, even in the gravest of crises. The death of Rosas, the Gaucha dictator of Buenos Ayres, in exile in England, was as great a surprise as that of the forgotten Abbé Sieyès to his contemporaries (or, as we might more fitly say, his posterity). The list of departed statesmen is certainly not brilliant, nor was he the greatest whose death was really of the most political importance, Indiana's Favorite Son, Senator Morton. The better part of French politics could sincerely regret the loss of MM. Ernest Picard and Alexandre Glais-Bizoin; the worse part could hardly mourn M. Drouyn de Lhuys. Agitators like Dr. Johann Jacoby and George Odger will be variously classed, but they at least helped to raise questions which statesmen had to settle. No soldier of undying renown passed away, though the list includes a veteran of many generations, Field-Marshal Von Wrangel, and Generals Von Steinmetz, Changarnier, and D'Aurelle de Paladines; in this country, the Confederate General Forrest, of unsavory memory. Rear-Admiral Sir Edward Belcher, of the naval dead, is sure of being long remembered, by Arctic preservation, as we may say. Rear-Admiral Wilkes left his mark "under the frozen serpent of the South," and had peculiar claims to a pretty far-reaching notoriety in connection with the history of the rebellion. His associates, Rear-Admirals Alden, Bailey, Davis, and Goldsborough, had each a lustre of their own, but must sooner be forgotten. Admiral Semmes, on the other hand, may vie with Wilkes in remembrance.

—Two journalists of the first rank, François Buloz and Walter Bagehot, the one mainly an editor, the other mainly a writer, adorn the necrology of 1877. Nor is the roll of authors insignificant, especially if we name Thiers again in this class. By a curious coincidence the Frenchman who did most to foster the Imperial legend died in the same year with the Frenchman who did most to uproot it—Pierre Lafrey, the lamented historian of Napoleon I. Spain lost Fernan Caballero, whose skill as a novelist was equalled by her mediæval obscurantism; Denmark, the poet Winther; Sweden, her greatest living poet, Johan Ludvig Runeberg; Germany, the Anglo-Saxon scholar, Grein; Russia, the erudite Joseph Bodianski, the ardent Slav antiquarian, and Anthony Mukhlinski, the eminent Orientalist. Among English-speaking writers, the fame of our own Motley will be most enduring; but neither Edmund Quincy nor Lorenzo Sabine will be quickly forgotten, being also historians, each of his own kind. Unique, too, was John S. C. Abbott. An interesting period in our Revolutionary history—the intervention of France—had been only partially treated by Thomas Balch when his labors were brought to a sudden close. In England, Julia Kavanagh, the late-living Lady Stirling Maxwell (Mrs. Norton), and Samuel Warren will not be missed from the ranks of active literary producers. Metaphysical writers of distinction were Alexander Bain, Taylor Lewis, and Henry B. Smith. Authors, too, were Ambrose-Firmin Didot and William Longman, and these, with Fletcher Harper, represent well the great publishing interests of their respective countries.

—In science, Le Verrier's name leads all the rest; but Philip Carpenter and John G. Anthony, conchologists, and F. B. Meek, paleontologist, wanted neither arduous nor ability in their several fields, and with them, if of a somewhat lower rank, James Orton should be mentioned and remembered. Art has lost Gustave Courbet, the painter, who led in the destruction of the Vendôme column, and Margaret Foley, a meritorious Boston sculptor and cameo-cutter. The stage loses, of playwrights, Philip Edward Devrient, the Viennese Mosenthal, and Théodore Barrière; of actors, Mattilda Heron, E. L. Davenport, and Edwin Adams; of singers, Titiens; of critics, John Oxenford. A great inventor, Fox Talbot, for ever to be associated with the discovery of photography, also takes a high rank among scientists and scholars; Ross Winans and R. P. Parrott, inventor of the gun which bears his name, were America's losses in this class. Americans, too, were those geniuses of enterprise, Henry Meiggs and Cornelius Vanderbilt; while James Brown and Moses H. Grinnell won a more legitimate distinction in commerce and exchange. Two philanthropists, Robert Dale Owen and Mary Carpenter; and one prelate, Cardinal Sforza, conclude our list without completing it.

—Zur Deutsch-Skandinavischen Geschichte des XV. Jahrhunderts, by Freiherr von der Ropp, is a sketch, in 114 pages, of the process by which Queen Margaret's Union of Calmar (1397) was broken up under her incapable colleague and successor, Eric of Pomerania, and the three Scandinavian kingdoms restored to their former isolated independence. It

begins with the controversy with the Duke of Holstein in regard to the fief of Schleswig, after Margaret's death in 1412, and ends with the succession of Christopher of Bavaria to the three crowns in 1442—no longer as a federal union of the kingdoms, but as a mere personal union, which had no effect beyond the lifetime of the prince himself. Indeed, the fatal defect of the Union of Calmar was in providing an effective method by which the union of the crowns, complete in theory, could be secured in practice. It was an interesting attempt at a genuine federal union, which we hope to see adequately handled by Mr. Freeman whenever he takes up again his 'History of Federal Government.' The pamphlet before us closes (p. 112) with some valuable observations upon the relation of the crowns, and their authority under King Christopher III. The royal office had been forced to unite with the nobility to crush the liberties of the third estate, and at the same time to surrender its own prerogatives. In the next century the mischief was partially remedied in Denmark by its conversion into an absolute monarchy, as the only practicable counterpoise to the nobility and protection for the lower orders. It was Eric's pitiful reign that destroyed at once the liberties of his kingdom and the hopes of a great united northern empire. About 75 pages of documents follow the essay.

HEBREW MYTHOLOGY.—II.*

THE process adopted by Professor Goldziher for resolving Hebrew legends into nature-myths is comparatively easy to a competent Semitic student, and there is no apparent reason why a single Scriptural character should be allowed to retain his personal individuality, unless it is that the scientific mythologist "resists the temptation" of transforming him in order to give added weight to the discoveries announced with respect to the rest; for the "scientific" methods adopted could be made to prove the solar symbolism of Arphaxad as readily as that of any other personage identified by the author—as readily, indeed, as the Rabbin of old proved that the names of every object in the universe were to be found in the death-song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.), or as "pickled cucumber" has been shown to be derived from "King Jeremiah," through the easy stages of "Jeremiah King," "Jerry King," "Jerking," and "Gherkin."

First, with great show of exactness, certain psychological postulates are laid down, to prove how the mind of the untutored savage works in observing natural phenomena, in transmuting these into myths, and in handing them down to posterity, and how posterity, gradually advancing in civilization, remoulds and develops them. Then it is assumed that certain ideas and epithets are invariably attached to certain objects and processes of nature, and whenever these ideas or epithets can be recognized in a proper name, or injected into it by any torturing of radical, prefix or suffix, the mythologist turns triumphantly around and assures us in the most positive manner that science has demonstrated the wearer of the name to be the sun or the moon, the night or the day, the cloud or the dawn, as the case may be. If the result is too ludicrously incongruous, the author repudiates all responsibility. "Whoever," he says, "finds contradictions in all this must not turn against the interpreter and reconstructor of the myth, but against the mind of man itself which created myths; his dispute lies with the latter, not with the methods of mythological science" (p. 174).

The vice of these scientific methods is fairly illustrated by Prof. Goldziher's laborious investigation of the altered relations which man bears to nature when he passes from the nomadic to the agricultural stage of existence. To an ordinary reasoner it would appear that this would be a matter of climate; that the estimation of the cloud or the sun as respectively beneficent or maleficent would depend upon the prevalence of drought or rain, heat or cold, and that an inhabitant of Scandinavia would look upon these natural objects with very different feelings and construct upon them myths very different from those suggesting themselves to the inhabitant of the Libyan desert. The scientific mythologist, however, deals with general principles, and to obtain them expands particulars into generals without the slightest hesitation. Prof. Goldziher's theory, for instance, requires that the Hebrew myths should have been formed in the rudest nomadic stage; that during that period the night, the moon, and the cloudy sky should be regarded as beneficial, and that when the nomads settled to agricultural life the sun should in turn become the source of life and prosperity. To prove this as a general principle he devotes

a long and elaborate disquisition (pp. 58-89) and he frequently refers to it subsequently as an established fact, regardless of the self-evident proposition that while the nomads of the Arabian desert may prefer to travel by night, as he superabundantly proves, those of the steppes of Tartary may naturally prefer the day; and that although in England the husbandman may regard the sun as a perpetual benefactor, in Palestine his great enemy was drought, and his most longed-for blessing was cloud and rain. The Deuteronomist wrote when the agricultural stage had been long established, yet he represents Yahveh as promising as a reward for obedience, "I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain," and as likening the droppings of the clouds to his own teachings: "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew; as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass" (Deut. xi. 14; xxxii. 2). Nowhere, we believe, throughout Scripture, after the Deluge, is the rain spoken of as hurtful, except an allusion in Proverbs (xxviii. 3) to a "sweeping rain," and a "great rain" which frightened the people in the time of Ezra (Ez. x. 9), while throughout the Talmudical writings few subjects are more frequently alluded to than rain as the object of supplication to God. Of course, therefore, all deductions based upon the assumed preference of the Hebrew agriculturist for sunshine are worthless.

The same facile assumption of general principles is observable throughout. If it becomes necessary to disregard time in adapting a legend or a religious belief to the desired explanation, we are gravely told as an incontrovertible truth "that at the earliest mythical stage the distinction of time is very feebly presented" (pp. 42-3); as though man, when sufficiently advanced to have invented language and constructed elaborate and fanciful personifications of the processes and relationships of nature, had not an idea of the sequence of time and events. In fact, these rude savages must have reached a point which other races did not attain until their full development, for they must have discovered the solar year of 365 days if Prof. Goldziher be correct in identifying Enoch with the sun chiefly for the reason that he is said to have lived 365 years before his translation to heaven (p. 126). Yet of the rude nomads who must thus have solved the problem which puzzled Rome until the time of Cæsar it can be said that "mythic thought did not attain to the category of causality; for this category presupposes a clear consciousness of succession, or of one event following another in the order of time" (p. 43).

Having thus released himself from all trammels of reason and fact, it is easy for the mythologist to assert all necessary postulates and deduce from them whatever conclusions he may desire. Any vocable which can by any philological process be tortured into the sense of motion, or rest, or red, or white, or round, or hairy, or breaking forth, is at once proclaimed to prove that its possessor is a solar hero. Thus, the name Hagar is assumed to be formed from a root *hajara*, unknown to Hebrew, signifying "to fly," and, as one of the attributes of the sun is its flight through the sky, it follows at once that "the mythic designation Hagar is consequently only one of the names of the sun in a feminine form"; and, as Abraham had previously been proved to be the night and Sarah the moon, we are told of the domestic difficulties of the patriarch that "the battle of the two figures of the night-sky against Hagar is again that inexhaustible theme of all mythology, the battle of Day with Night" (p. 119). So, if the idea assigned to the name or history of the personage be that of rest, then he must be the sun sinking to his rest after the movement of the day, as in the case of Noah (p. 131). Asher, on the other hand, the son of Jacob, is declared to be self-evidently a solar name, because the root *ashar* (אָשַׁר) has a significance of walking straight forwards, besides its ordinarily accepted one of pronouncing happy (p. 122). Similarly, Dan is no longer, as heretofore, to be derived from *din* (דִּין), "to judge," but a root must be found for it elsewhere, in some other Semitic tongue, which can be wrested into the significance of movement, and thus both Dan and his sister Dinah "must denote he or she who marches on, or comes nearer, or goes in general, synonymous with Asher—i. e., the Sun" (p. 124). And this identification of Asher with the sun enables the author to solve the hitherto insoluble problem as to the exact meaning of the mysterious Asherah, who consequently becomes the feminine counterpart, or wife, of Asher the sun—though, curiously enough, this counterpart, or wife, is said to be the moon, in violent contradiction to what we have just seen of the quarrel inevitable between the sun and moon in their characters of Hagar and Sarah. Returning to Dinah, we find that as Shechem (p. 25-6) had already been proved to represent the morning dawn, it becomes self-evident that her misadventure with him meant only that "the Dawn snatched up the sun to himself and was united with her." Moreover, the

* Mythology among the Hebrews, and its Historical Development. By Ignaz Goldziher, Ph.D., member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Translated from the German, with additions by the author, by Russell Martinson, M.A., of the British Museum. 1 vol. 8vo, pp. xxv+457. London, 1877.

vengeance taken by the sons of Jacob (the Night-Sky) is merely the destruction of the sun when it sinks at evening (p. 125); and as Shechem is the son of the Ass (Hamor), we are led to a further identification, since "the reddish-brown ass is one of the animals used in the old mythology to designate the Sun" (p. 181).

Esau, too, is the sun, because he is described as a hunter, and "the Sun is a hunter; he discharges his arrows—i.e., his rays—and does battle with them against darkness, wind, and clouds"—besides which he is red and hairy, which is conclusive (p. 123-7). This redness, in fact, is an important symptom, for though Laban is likewise the sun because his name signifies "white" (pp. 140-1), the sun's distinctive color seems to be red. The name of the father of mankind has hitherto been considered by scholars to mean father or man. Lenormant tells us that *Adda* in Proto-Medie and *Acead* is "father," and when pluralized in the ordinary way by the addition of the radical *mes* it becomes *Addames*; and George Smith and Sir Henry Rawlinson assure us that in Assyrian *Adam* means "man," and *Admi*, *Adami*, or *Adamu* means the dark race, as distinguished from the *Sarku*, or light race. This would seem to afford abundant explanation of the name of our prototype, but Prof. Goldziher pays no attention to such commonplace derivations. Esau, as we have seen, is the sun, because one of his appellatives was *Edom* (עֲדָם), or "the red." Now *Adam* (אָדָם), we are told, "is, as is obvious at a glance, a solar appellation. 'the Red' (עֲדָם); etymologically the same word as *Edom*" (p. 209)—and this, of course, settles the question. So *Eve*, or *Havvah*, is "the Circulating," "the feminine synonym of *Zebhulun*, 'the Round,' a very ancient appellation of the sun" (p. 210). *Cain* and *Abel* are only a repetition of the all-pervading myth. *Cain*, who is the sun, slays *Abel*, who is the night (p. 110). *Lot* and his daughters are likewise a solar myth. *Lot* means "he who covers," and "surely no one will, after all this, doubt that the name *Lot* is a designation of the 'covering Night,'" and his daughters the morning and evening twilight (pp. 189-96). *Jonah* in the belly of the whale is only the sun swallowed by the sea to be "spit out on the shore" (p. 102).

So the author runs glibly on, through nearly four hundred octavo pages, flippantly flinging around his crude guesses as the positive deductions of a rigid scientific analysis. Any one familiar with the extraordinary system of exegesis invented by the Amoraim of the Talmud for the purpose of making any given text bear any meaning which suited them at the moment, would imagine that the human mind could produce nothing more whimsically false, but the thirteen rules of interpretation which formed the instruments of the Halakha are tame in comparison with the scientific methods of a resolute discoverer of nature-myths. The only previous system to which the latter can be likened is the "soul of souls"—the thirteen hermeneutical rules of the Kabbalists, and even these are commonplace beside the brilliant fancies of our author. To prove by *Gematria* that the world shall last six thousand years because the letter *aleph*, which signifies 1,000, occurs six times in the first verse of *Genesis*, is a much humbler exhibition of penetrating insight than to demonstrate that *Jephthah* (*Yiphtah*) is the "Opener," or *Sun*, who slays his daughter, the morning twilight (pp. 97-104). Equally poverty-stricken is the imagination of the *Bereshith Rabba*, which explains the hidden significance of the name of *Isaac* (יִצְחָק = *Yits'hak*) by pointing out that the *yod* (י), or 10, means the ten commandments which the patriarch studiously observed; the *tsade* (צ), or 90, is the age of his mother at his birth; the *heth* (ח), or 8, shows that he was the first who was circumcised on the eighth day after birth; and the *koph* (ק), or 100, signifies the age of his father, *Abraham*, when he was begotten. This is tame and spiritless enough alongside of the poetical science of the comparative mythologist explaining the myth "Abram kills his son *Isaac*." "At that primitive stage these expressions naturally signified no more than the words imply. 'עֲדָם, *Abh Rām*, the *Lofty Father*, kills his son, יִשְׁחָק, *Yishchak*, the *Laugher*.' The Nightly Heaven and the sun, or the Sunset, child of the Night, fell into a strife in the evening, the result of which is that the *Lofty Father* kills his child; the day must give way to night" (p. 47).

One would feel more disposed to yield to the blandishments of this new science were it not for observing that occasionally the results of its methods, tried by its own standards, seem not to be as infallibly accurate as its professors assert. In other sciences given data must yield the same solution, whatever be the process employed or the person employing it, but in comparative mythology given data apparently will yield any result that

the manipulator desires. Thus, on p. 57, we find that our author proves to a demonstration that *Jacob* (*Ya'akob*) is "the after-follower," or *Night*—in fact, a mere repetition of his grandsire, *Abraham*, or the *Lofty Father*; but turning to p. 431, in Steinthal's appended essay on *Samson*, that eminent precursor of *Goldziher* assures us that *Jacob* is identical with *Hermes Palamon*, and therefore is a form of the *Sun-god*. Between two such conflicting authorities it is not easy to decide, unless some new development of the science shall enable a third professor to reconcile the apparent discrepancy, by proving through strictly scientific methods that the *Sun* and the *Night*, in mythical language, are one and the same thing—a feat which could readily be accomplished through the interpellation of the Egyptian *Tum*, the sun of the under world.

Professor *Goldziher*'s book, in short, reads like the nightmare of a professor in the Academy of *Laputa*; and if it were not that so serious a scholar as Mr. *Martineau* has thought it worthy of translation, we should be inclined to regard it as a huge and ponderous mystification, after the German fashion, designed to burlesque the labors of his forerunners in the "science."

SULLIVAN'S NEW IRELAND.*

MR. SULLIVAN, who has long been a prominent Irish member of the House of Commons, offers in the present volume a series of sketches illustrative of the political and social changes which have taken place in Ireland within the last thirty years—that is, since the famine of 1846-7. The book is badly made up in one respect. It has no index, and the headings of the thirty-three chapters which compose it give, in eleven instances, only the faintest idea of the subject of the chapter. The other twenty-two seem to be the mysterious titles of a popular novel, such as "Looking Back," "After Scenes," "The Crimson Stain," "The Suicide Banker," "A Troubled Time," and "Delenda est Carthago." The reader in search of serious information who should be deterred from taking it up by this peculiarity of the table of contents, would, however, make a mistake. Mr. Sullivan is a serious writer, and has managed to put into a very taking shape the sum and substance of the last half-century of Irish history. But then it is not in a shape, unless we are greatly mistaken, which will attract many readers who are not Irishmen, or have not followed recent events in Ireland pretty closely. He is, as we have said, rather an elucidator than a narrator. He presumes on the reader's knowledge of a large mass of facts of which few but Irishmen know anything, and he devotes a good deal of space to some facts the importance of which few but Irishmen will appreciate. He virtually acknowledges all this in his preface, in saying "that it was not his purpose to write a formal history of the period, but to supply a series of sketches or narratives which may, perhaps, assist the reader in the readier and more correct appreciation of visible results." The chief reason for referring to it as a defect of the work is that he "has kept in mind the fact that his book will be published and read in England," and he might have added in America also, and has had the "ambition to hope that it might assist in promoting a kindlier feeling between the New England and the New Ireland."

Some of his reminiscences of the old and vanished Ireland are very touching, but nearly all the changes he describes are for the better. The National Schools, the cheap press, and the increased facility of locomotion, have made one great revolution in Irish politics in making personal leadership, such as it was in O'Connell's day, impossible. There cannot be in Ireland such another tribune as he was. For the same reason Mr. Sullivan maintains that the priests do not possess, and cannot acquire, the political influence they once held. The power enjoyed by O'Connell and the Catholic clergy down to 1848 was the natural result of the gross ignorance and political subjection of the Catholic population. For over a century the priest was the one man of education the peasant knew and confided in, and O'Connell was the first Catholic politician who took up the cause of his countrymen with courage and ability. Since that day the popular horizon has greatly broadened, popular self-confidence has greatly increased, and the habit of forming one's own opinions with the aid of the newspaper become strong and widespread. This, too, accounts in a considerable degree for the sorry figure in the matter of leadership which Irish discontent has cut of late in the eyes of many people, as compared with its manifestations in the old days of the Volunteers and the United Irishmen. The Fenian and Home-Rule chiefs do not compare well as regards character and station with the earlier apostles of Irish liberty, but the explanation is that it is now far harder to lead than it used to be; neither character nor station counts for much.

* New Ireland. By A. M. Sullivan, Member of Parliament for Louth. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1878.

In other words, to put the matter in a sentence, the Irish people has been somewhat democratized.

Another powerful agent in transforming Irish opinion and manners has been the emigration to America, and the great increase in closeness of relation between the Irish settlers in this country and their friends at home through cheap postage and cheap steam communication. But that the influence of this has been wholesome in any way except in stimulating enterprise, few will maintain. There is probably no country in the world to which the average Irish peasant was less fitted to come, as regards moral and mental outfit, than the United States. He never gets here more than an imperfect comprehension of the laws and manners, and their effect on him is to destroy or greatly enfeeble some of his most valuable prejudices and traditions, without supplying any better to take their place as motives or guides. In fact, the Irish people would not have been ready for emigration to this country, as things have gone and are going, before the year 1925; and if it were not for their children's sake, one would regret that it began any sooner. There was no people in Europe farther from republicanism or democracy in 1829, the date of Catholic Emancipation. Mr. Sullivan seems to have some inkling of this himself, but of the unfortunate effect of the emigration to the United States on the Irish political reputation he seems to have none. Probably nothing has done more to destroy foreign sympathy for Ireland, and foreign interest in Irish questions, and to separate Irish Liberalism from Liberalism everywhere else, than the part played by the Irish vote and Irish politicians in America.

Mr. Sullivan's account of the Irish share in bringing about the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and of the formation of the "Home-Rule" party, as well as his illustrations of the working of the Encumbered Estates Act and of Gladstone's Land-Tenure Act, giving a measure of protection to the tenant-farmers against landlord exactions and oppression, are highly pictorial, but will be found a useful key to much that is still puzzling to foreigners in Irish politics. They furnish, too, an explanation of the difficulty that English and Irish legislators have in working together. Indeed, Mr. Sullivan's own talk about Irish questions would almost suffice for that purpose. He is full of sentiment and enthusiasm on every subject he touches. Smile follows tear and tear smile, no matter of what he is treating. For literary and art purposes nothing can be more attractive or effective than this state of mind; for the work of constitutional government nothing more unfortunate. It was a true, though perhaps melancholy, saying of the late Mr. Bagehot that it is the humdrum, unimaginative peoples who have succeeded in politics, and it is a saying that Irish politicians cannot take too much to heart.

Money and Legal Tender in the United States. By H. R. Linderman, Director of the Mint. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. 175.)—The frequent citations from Dr. Linderman's little work by the *Nation*, in the current discussion of the silver question, is the best testimony we can offer as to its usefulness. It does not purport to be a systematic treatise on money, or a treatise of any kind, but a convenient hand-book on coinage, legal tender, mint regulations and the reasons for them, and the statistics of this and foreign countries relating to the subject treated, with sufficient argumentative treatment to connect all the branches of the work together. Nevertheless, the chapter on the proposed remonetization of silver in the United States is as concise and comprehensive and dispassionate as any argument that has come from the press since the controversy began. The conclusions of the author upon this point are, that the Bland Silver Bill is an unwise measure under any circumstances; that if silver is to be remonetized at all it should be done by international action; that if international action is postponed, the French basis of 15½ to 1 should be adopted, so as to leave the door open for international arrangements hereafter; and that "free coinage," at the present difference between gold and silver in the markets, would be an evident swindle. In all these particulars Dr. Linderman approves himself well qualified to write upon these questions, and to fill the office he holds as Director of the Mint.

As to merely technical matters, such as the coinage and legal-tender acts, the par of exchange, subsidiary coins, foreign coins and their valuation, etc., nothing could be more lucid and methodical than his arrangement of the several subjects and his treatment of them. He furnishes a candid statement of the reasons for passing the Act of February 12, 1873, in which the silver dollar of 412½ grains was dropped from the list of authorized coins of the United States, and gives an account of the reasons for coining the trade-dollar, and of the success which has attended the

operation in our intercourse with China. These reasons, in brief, are that there was a large market for silver in China, and that the Chinese, like other people, were disposed to give a preference to the article which came nearest to their tastes and customs and which best answered the requirements of goodness, uniformity, and convenience. Such an article was the Mexican dollar until the American trade-dollar made its appearance in the Chinese ports. "It is the best dollar ever seen here," says the Hong-Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation. Its popularity has been remarkable, when we consider the conservative character of the Chinese populations. Dr. Linderman's success in this particular—for he was the projector of the trade-dollar—is in no sense different from that of any manufacturer who diligently studies the wants of his customers and adapts his wares to them. The trade-dollar is a silver ingot of the form, size, weight, and purity most liked by the people who buy it, and the market for American silver has been essentially improved by it.

The appendix contains about fifty pages of valuable statistical matter, bearing upon the silver question, the production and distribution of the precious metals, and cognate matters.

Music in the House. By John Hullah, LL.D. (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1877.)—"It may be accepted as an axiom that no musical performance is so delightful as that to the production of which we ourselves contribute." If we except operas, oratorios, and symphonies, and thus limit Dr. Hullah's statement to chamber-music, or "music in the house," it may be regarded as correct. Such music loses much of its effectiveness when transplanted from the parlor into the spacious concert-room, for which it was never intended. There is in our American and English homes a regrettable deficiency of concerted music for piano and violin or cello, for string quartettes, and for the other possible combinations of string instruments. The little book before us is a plea for this class of music, as well as for such vocal music as does not call for a large chorus. There was a time when musical culture was so common in England that at an evening party it was considered an odd thing if a guest was found who could not join the chorus. But the irrational policy of a church which mistook musical enjoyment for mere pleasure of sense, and accordingly condemned it, put an end to this state of affairs. At the present time the exclusive devotion of our young men to athletic sports is the chief impediment to æsthetic culture. They will be interested to learn that Dr. Hullah thinks that for a general increase of skill in violin-playing in the immediate future we must look to female aid; and he aptly reminds us that the old prejudice against female violinists is rapidly dying out, just as the piano long ago ceased to be regarded as exclusively "a woman's instrument."

After a general introduction Dr. Hullah treats, in three chapters, of "unaccompanied vocal music," "instrumental music," and "accompanied vocal music" for the house, briefly alluding to the history and literature of each division. Then come two more chapters on "practice and rehearsal," and "the musical library." The reader will find some useful hints regarding the selection of pianos and of music for performance, the treatment of the voice, and the relations of words to music, besides some general information and gossip. But otherwise we cannot say much for the book, although we thoroughly sympathize with its aims. Properly condensed, it would have made an interesting magazine article, but there is scarcely enough matter or thought in it to give it a *raison d'être* as a book. However, if a person wishes to spend a dollar on music it will be infinitely better to buy such a book than to encourage by purchase the manufacture of the abominable sheet-music which our publishing houses are turning out every week by the wholesale.

A History of the United States of America, including some important facts mostly omitted in the smaller histories. Designed for general reading and for academies. By Josiah W. Leeds. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1877. 12mo, pp. 468.)—Mr. Leeds's history of the United States is in refreshing contrast to the common run of school histories. Not that we have any fault to find with the best of these; they have improved vastly within the last few years, and there are several which could hardly be improved for their purposes. But even these seem to be all cast in one mould, and to vary very little from one another in substance. Mr. Leeds has set before himself a different task—to write a history of the civilization of the country rather than its wars and political history. He has undertaken to do, in a modest way, what Mr. Green has done for England—to write a history of the American people; and his success is good. The book is, therefore, well adapted to be a sequel or companion

to a school history of the ordinary type, as containing much matter omitted in that class of books, and occupying a wholly different point of view. Or, it will answer as a sole manual for any who may desire to have the military history relegated to a secondary place.

Mr. Leeds appears to be a Friend, and maintains the principles of his creed even in a school text-book. His style is on the whole good, sober but not dull; we notice the frequent abomination of *transpire* in the sense of *happen*. Much the largest part (twenty-one chapters out of thirty-two) is devoted to the Colonial period; and this period is very well and perspicuously arranged. The titles of the chapters, too, are often graphic: "The Spaniards—their cruel treasure-hunt"; "George I. A period of Financiering." The period of the Republic is treated with less fulness, sometimes several administrations being compressed into one chapter; and the Revolutionary War occupies only one chapter of nineteen pages. On page 17 we find mention of a brief of Pope Nicholas V. of 1498; in this year Alexander VI. was Pope. In the "Physical Aspect of the Country" (page 13) the description is quite inadequate, as no notice is taken of the remarkable system of lakes and rivers (the St. Lawrence, etc.) by which the Mississippi Valley is directly connected with the Atlantic.

PROF. WALKER'S BOOK ON

MONEY

Will be published IMMEDIATELY.
HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

BOOKS

For College, School, and Town Libraries,
Private Collections, Family
Bookshelves.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

182 Fifth Avenue, New York,

Still continue to make it a special and important part of their business to attend to orders for PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS and INDIVIDUALS who desire to have accurate information and suggestions as to the best books and the best editions, and to purchase what they need, whether in thousand or a single book, in the most economical way. Orders for American or Foreign Books of every description, whether for whole libraries or for single books, are carefully and promptly executed. The experience acquired by thirty-seven years' study of this specialty on both sides of the Atlantic will, it is believed, be useful to book-buyers with reference to choice of the best books and the best editions, and also with reference to ECONOMY.

English and American Catalogues supplied.

Send for "The Best Reading." "Supplies a need that has long been felt." A valuable classified Bibliography. Paper, \$1 25; cloth, \$1 75.

They also issue "The Library Companion," a Quarterly Supplement to "The Best Reading," price 50 cents a year.

They receive subscriptions at clubbing rates for all periodicals American and Foreign.

The one who writes under the pen-name of Stuart Sterne, and whose writings have shown an increasing beauty of expression, flowing, graceful diction, has sent out a new poem, entitled 'Angelo.' It is sweet and tuneful, its flow is always easy, and its imagery tender and lovely. It is seldom anything so good comes from one who only uses a pen-name.—Boston Traveller.

Price \$1. For sale at the bookstores.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.

THE RIVERSIDE PRESS, CAMBRIDGE.

The great schemes of French empire on this continent were built upon this, the most striking feature of our physical geography.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publisher.—Price.
Deland (Julia), Biographies of Francis Lewis and Morgan Lewis, 2 vols. swd.	(A. D. F. Randolph & Co.) \$2 00
Fernow (B.), Dutch and Swedish Settlements on the Delaware River. Vol. XII. (Albany)	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Hill (C. S.), Our Merchant Marine, 3d ed.	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Hudson (Rev. H. N.), Classical English Reader.	(Ginn & Heath)
Home Songs for Little People.	(James Miller)
Houghton (G.), Album Leaves, swd.	(Estes & Lauriat)
Ingersoll (Dr. A. J.), In Health.	(A. J. Ingersoll)
Kiepert (H.), Lehrbuch der alten Geographie: Asien und Africa, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Lamb (Charles and Mary), Poetry for Children; and Prince Dorus.	(Scribner, Armstrong & Co.) 1 25
Little (A.), Early New England Interiors.	(A. Williams & Co.) 6 00
Littre (E.), Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Langue française, Part 8, swd.	(F. W. Christern)
Littell's Living Age, Oct.-Dec. 1877.	(Littell & Gay)
Mason (Mrs. J.), All about Edith.	(H. B. Niles & Co.) 1 25
Poems of the Old South.	(Wm. F. Gill & Co.) 1 50
Royce (S.), Deterioration and Race Education.	(New York)
Shelley (P. B.), Poetical Works, 2 vols.	(Hurd & Houghton) 3 50
Some Highways and Byways of American Travel.	(J. R. Lippincott & Co.)
Spurgeon (Rev. C. H.), The Matchless Mystery.	(Scheldon & Co.)
White (H.), The Tariff Question, swd.	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 25
Williams (H. T.), Household Hints and Recipes, swd.	(H. T. Williams)
Wood (Prof. De V.), Principles of Elementary Mechanics.	(John Wiley & Sons) 2 00
Walker (C. M.), Life of Oliver P. Morton.	(Indianapolis Journal)
Westcott (T.), Historic Mansions and Buildings of Philadelphia.	(H. Porter & Coates)

A few Choice Sets

Of Best Books from

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO.'S CLEARANCE SALE.

	Retail price.	Reduced price.
Dickens's Works. Illustrated Library edition. 30 vols. crown 8vo. London. Half-leopard.	\$125 00	\$75 00
Waverley Novels. Black's Edinburgh edition. 204 steel engravings. 25 vols. 8vo, tree-calf, gilt.		125 00
Bulwer's Novels. 25 vols., half-morocco.	100 00	50 00
Iring's Works. 27 vols. 12mo, half-calf.	120 00	70 00
Audubon's Birds of America. 8 vols. 8vo, half-morocco.		145 00
Macaulay's Works. Complete. 16 vols. crown 8vo, half-morocco, gilt.	58 00	37 00
Motley's Complete Works. 4 vols., half-leopard.	45 00	30 00
Milman's Complete Works. Comprising History of the Jews, 3 vols.; Christianity, 3 vols.; Latin Christianity, 8 vols. 14 vols. crown 8vo, half-calf.	49 00	27 50
Taine's Works. Complete. 13 vols. crown 8vo, half-velum.	65 00	40 00
Nichols's Literary History of the Eighteenth Century. 8 vols. 8vo, Portraits, tree-calf.	75 00	40 00
Miss Edgeworth's Novels and Tales. 12 vols. post 8vo. London. Half-morocco.	32 00	18 00
Percy's Ballads and Romances. Edited by Hales and Furnivall. 3 vols. 8vo, polished calf.	45 00	22 50
Webster's Dictionary. 2 vols., large paper, folio, half-morocco.	50 00	28 00
Shakespeare's Complete Works. Edited by Richard Grant White. 12 vols. 8vo, large paper, half-Roxburghe.		50 00
Smollett's Works. New edition. Edited by J. P. Browne. 8 vols. 8vo, calf, gilt.	42 00	22 50
Brougham's Works. Complete. 11 vols. 12mo, half-calf.	40 00	27 50
Hallam's Historical Works. English edition. 10 vols. post 8vo, half-calf.	37 50	20 00
Boswell's Life of Johnson. Croker's edition. With upwards of fifty illustrations. 10 vols. 16mo, early copy, half-crushed levant.	40 00	25 00

This Clearance Sale, which includes our entire stock, will continue only till January 12.

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO. Boston.

THE Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography.

Quarterly; 115 pp. in each number; beautifully printed on extra-fine paper, and illustrated.

Subscription, three dollars per annum in advance.

Address

PUBLICATION FUND OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA,

No. 820 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

182 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Have recently published for

"THE SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL CULTURE."

Creed and Deed.

A SERIES OF DISCOURSES

By FELIX ADLER, PH.D.

8vo cloth extra \$1 00.

"A book that is a stimulus to thinking. No one can read it without gaining information and being deeply impressed by its moral and intellectual elevation."—*Times* & *Review*.

"The book is very readable. The style is good, the statements are clear, the sentiment is refined, and the moral aim, so far as conduct and character are concerned, is pure and lofty."—*N. Y. Times*.

"A logical, beautiful, and valuable work. The fruit of a courageous, earnest, cultivated, thoroughly masculine, and yet sympathetic and poetic mind."—*Freeman's Magazine*.

For sale by all dealers, and sent prepaid, on receipt of price, by the publishers.

'L'Art.'

'L'ART: WEEKLY ARTISTIC REVIEW.
THIRD YEAR.

Upwards of sixty etchings in the year.
Choice Wood Engravings, and
Reviews by first writers.

'L'ART: The *Times* says: "It is simply the cheapest and best thing of its kind."

'L'ART: The *Saturday Review* says: "Full of good, sober, and just criticism."

'L'ART: The *W. M.* says: "Abounds in matters of interest to all readers and students of aesthetic and cultivated taste."

'L'ART: Terms of Subscription and full particulars may be obtained of

J. W. BOUTON, 706 Broadway, N. Y.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,

77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

BACK NUMBERS AND COMPLETE SETS of all the leading MAGAZINES and REVIEWS for sale cheap, at the American and Foreign Magazine Depot, 24 Dey Street, New York City.

Kansas Pacific Railway.

One-half of the amount of each coupon which matured Nov. 1, 1877—being Coupon No. 17—from bonds of this Company, known as the Denver Extension First Mortgage 7 Per Cent. Bonds, will be paid on presentation at the National Bank of Commerce in New York.

Coupons must be left over-night for examination, and a receipt will be given therefor.

January 13, 1878

C. S. GREELEY, } Receivers.
H. VILLARD, }

NOVELTIES.

GOBINEAU, CTE. La Renaissance. \$2.40.
DAUDET, L. Nabab. \$1.40.
GREVILLE, H. Œuvres. Per vol., \$1.40.
SAND, N. Nouvelles Lettres d'un Voyageur. \$1.45.
New Catalogues of Foreign Literature.

SCHOENHOF & MOELLER, 40 Winter Street, Boston.

Slave Songs of the United States.

A Unique Collection of Original Melodies—words and music—obtained among the Negroes of the South; preceded by an Account of these Songs, and an Essay on the Negro Dialect, as observed at Port Royal. By Prof. W. F. Allen, of the University of Wisconsin. Cloth, 8vo, price \$1.50.

Sent, post-paid, on receipt of the price by Publisher of the Nation.

Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Co., 45 William St.

Hanover Fire Insurance Co.

120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Capital paid in in Cash.....\$500,000 00
Reserves for all liabilities, including reinsurance.....635,489 45
Net surplus.....499,393 14
Total assets.....\$1,632,882 59

R. S. WALCOTT, President.
I. REMSEN LANE, Secretary.

Dundee Marmalade,

By the celebrated makers, JAMES KEILLER & SON.
NEW SEASON, DELICIOUS, &c. Steamer.

JOHN DUNCAN'S SONS,
UNION SQUARE.

Letter from Sir Henry Halford, Captain of British Team.

GARDEN CITY HOTEL, CREEDEMOOR, Sept. 17, 1877.
Messrs. Wm. S. Kimball & Co., Rochester, N. Y.:
GENTLEMEN: Pray accept my best thanks for the package of Vanity Fair Tobacco which I found here yesterday. It is the best tobacco I ever smoked, and will be a great source of enjoyment to me on my Western trip.

Believe me, yours truly, H. S. J. HALFORD.

SILVER Plated Ware.

THE
Meriden Britannia Company,
46 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET
(UNION SQUARE)
AND
550 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Are Manufacturing and have on Exhibition a Choice Selection of Desirable Articles especially appropriate for Gifts.

CENTENNIAL MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS were awarded to this Company for "SUPERIOR" SILVER-PLATED WARE.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 4050. NEW YORK.

FOR FLORIDA

AND
ALL POINTS SOUTH.

PASSENGERS AND FREIGHT.

Via NEW YORK AND SAVANNAH STEAMSHIP LINES,
Sailing from New York punctually at 3 P.M. every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, and connecting at Savannah with

THE CENTRAL RAILROAD OF GEORGIA
to all points in Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and with the

ATLANTIC AND GULF RAILROAD
to all points in Florida, Southern and Middle Georgia, etc., and with the

GEORGIA AND FLORIDA INLAND STEAMBOAT CO.
Steamers: City of Bridgeton and David Clark. For Freight or Passage by Thursday's ships, apply to MURRAY, FERRIS & CO., Agents, 62 South Street. By Tuesday and Saturday's ships, apply to GEO. YONGE, Agent, 109 Broadway, and at Pier 43, North River. C. D. OWENS, Agent A. & G. R. R., 315 Broadway.

For Portland (Oregon) and San Francisco, via Straits of Magellan and Valparaiso.

The elegant new steamship OREGON, Captain Conner, will sail as above from New York about the 15th of January. For freight or passage apply to

FREDERICK C. SCHMIDT,
No. 1 South William Street.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY, FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAMBURG, AND BREMEN.
First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60 gold currency.
For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., 100 N. 2d St.,
Reading Room, 100 N. 2d St.,
CUNARD LINE.
F. S. HED 1840.

FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston, once a week.

RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$50, \$100, and \$130, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.
STORAGE—\$25 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANCKLYN,
Bowling Green, New York

The Sort of Claims Resisted.

All honest claims against THE TRAVELERS INSURANCE CO. are promptly paid; and there is always a real satisfaction in giving an honest claimant the full benefit of his insurance. There are those, however, who try to speculate upon their policies by making claims and bringing suits for money to which they have no legal or equitable right, but which they hope to obtain by an unfair appeal to the prejudices of jurymen against corporations. In such cases the company has no alternative, and must defend itself, cost what it may. Several claims of this character have quite recently been decided in favor of the company.

Horace Gowan, of Dover, N. H., holding a policy of insurance against accidents for \$3,000, died of typhoid fever. Suit was brought by Attorney Copeland, and tried in the U. S. Circuit Court. Verdict for the Company.

Thomas R. Taylor, of Leavenworth, Kansas, committed suicide while under indictment for robbing the U. S. mails. He held accident policies to the amount of \$5,000. Suit brought and tried to a jury. Verdict for the Company.

William Preston, of Dover, N. H., was killed in trying to jump upon a moving train. Case tried to a jury, which disagreed, ten for the Company; two, however, voted for the plaintiff, declaring openly that they voted that way "as to rebuke other insurance companies," showing that their desire to "rebuke" other companies was stronger than their desire to be honest with THE TRAVELERS.

T. D. Lyon, Ottumwa, Iowa, brought suit against the Railway Passengers Assurance Company for a case of partial disability. Tried to a jury; verdict for plaintiff, under a charge of the judge that in some cases "partial disability" might be "total disability." The Supreme Court held the rulings of the judge below to be erroneous, and set aside the verdict.

Rev. David Klein, residence nowhere, made several claims under accident tickets, all of which claims, though exceedingly suspicious, were paid. At last, however, he tried it again for "a general concussion of his system," occasioned "by a railway train running into a team"; but as the records of the railway company disclosed no such disaster, and the evidence discovered no such injury, the claim was rejected. Suit brought and tried to a jury in New York, when his "system" had another "concussion" by a verdict for the Company.

The stereotyped and stale appeal to the prejudices of jurymen against corporations is pretty well worn out, and the courts are beginning to see the propriety of trying the merits of the case, rather than the strength of parties litigant.—Travelers' Record.

The Sort of Claims Paid.

The check doesn't restore the lost eye, but is a material help of special value under such an affliction:

NO. 11 SWAN STREET, ALBANY, NOV. 21, 1877.
GEORGE W. SHERMAN & CO., MANAGERS TRAVELERS INSURANCE COMPANY, of Hartford, Conn.:
GENTS: Your check for two hundred and sixty dollars (\$260) in payment of my claim for injuries received by me on the 17th day of last May, being in full for twenty-six weeks, at ten dollars per week, was duly received by me this morning. You know how much I appreciate the insurance, and I unhesitatingly recommend the "TRAVELERS" to every one as the embodiment of promptness, fairness, and all that is to be desired in personal insurance.

Very respectfully yours, MATTHEW C. CLARK.

Hurt by a simple slip or misstep:

MARSHALLTOWN, IOWA, NOV. 24, 1877.
TRAVELERS INSURANCE CO., Hartford, Conn.:
DEAR SIR: Please accept my sincere thanks for the prompt attention paid my claim, rendered on account of a severe sprained ankle, having received your draft for \$125, at the hands of Mr. Harry Bradley, your gentlemanly agent at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. I am, yours truly, BILLY H. WEEKS.

The hazards of railway service bring in many such as this:

SPARTA, WIS., December 1, 1877.
J. H. NOLAN, Gen. Agt. TRAVELERS INS. CO., Chicago:
DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your check for \$500, being payment in full, under accident policy held with your company on the life of my son, Joseph Ebert, who met his death while in the discharge of his duty as brakeman on freight train.

I desire to express my most sincere thanks for the very prompt manner on the part of the Travelers Insurance Company in adjusting this claim, and paying same without the least delay, and without any trouble or expense whatever on my part in preparing the claim; and recommending your company most cheerfully. I am, Respectfully yours, BARBARA EBERT.

Dr. Daly shall be heard next. He devotes a few weeks every year to hunting, and has insured in THE TRAVELERS on such occasions, thinking himself safe enough at other times. But before his last trip he was persuaded to take a yearly policy, and within two months his horse switched him in the eye.

328 FIFTH AVE., PITTSBURGH, PA., Dec. 17, 1877.
I. R. STAYTON, Esq., District Agt. TRAVELERS INS. COMPANY, Pittsburgh:

DEAR SIR: I hereby acknowledge the receipt of two hundred and thirty-two dollars and fourteen cents (\$232.14), indemnity for nine weeks and two days disability, at rate of twenty-five dollars a week, for an injury to my eye caused by the switch of a horse's tail. I take great pleasure in commending the prompt, business-like way in which just claims for accident are settled by the Travelers Insurance Company; and while I trust no further accident may befall me, yet I shall in future never be without a policy in THE TRAVELERS.—Yours very truly, W. H. DALY, M.D.

—Travelers' Record.

